

THE SOUTHERN PLANTER.

Devoted to Agriculture, Horticulture, and the Household Arts.

Agriculture is the nursing mother of the Arts.
—*Xenophon.*

Tillage and Pasturage are the two breasts of
the State.—*Sully.*

FRANK. G. RUFFIN, EDITOR.

F. G. RUFFIN & N. AUGUST, PROP'RS.

VOL. XVI.

RICHMOND, VA., DECEMBER, 1856.

No. 12.

JOURNAL OF THE FARMERS ASSEMBLY.

The Farmers Assembly of the Virginia State Agricultural Society, met in accordance with the call of the President of the Society on Tuesday the 28th of October, 1856, at 10 o'clock, A. M.

Dr. Wm. S. Morton called the Assembly to order, and on his motion, Mr. Charles B. Williams was appointed temporary clerk.

Dr. Morton then moved that the house proceed to organise by the election of Speaker, and nominated the Hon. William C. Rives of Albemarle for that office. John R. Edmunds, Esq., of Halifax, was also nominated, but withdrew his name. The roll was then called, and Mr. Rives declared duly elected.

Messrs. William H. Macfarland of Richmond city and O. M. Crutchfield of Spottsylvania, were appointed a committee to wait upon Mr. Rives, to inform him of his election and escort him to the chair.

On taking his seat, Mr. Rives said:

GENTLEMEN—I desire to express my very deep and unaffected sensibility of this mark of your favor and confidence, in the unexpected call to become your presiding officer. I say without the slightest affectation, that I do not feel worthy of so exalted a position, when I see many others around me who have rendered distinguished services in the great cause of agriculture; but since it has been the pleasure of my brother farmers to bestow upon me this evidence of their favor, I shall consider it a thorough admission into the family of farmers of Virginia. However unworthy, be assured that I shall do whatever I can, compatibly with my limited experience as a presiding officer, to assist you in the accomplishment of the great work for which you have convened, and of my anxious desire to fulfil the expectations and promote the interest of the agricultural community.

Mr. R. W. Noland was then nominated and elected clerk of the Assembly.

On motion of Mr. Crutchfield,

Resolved, That the rules of the House of Del-

egates of Virginia, so far as applicable to the government of this body, be adopted by the Assembly.

ROLL OF DELEGATES TO THE FARMERS' ASSEMBLY.

Albemarle—Wm. C. Rives, Thomas J. Randolph, Franklin Minor, William S. Dabney and R. W. Noland.

Alexandria—Washington T. Harper.

Amelia—R. F. Taylor, R. L. Booker.

Amherst—Dr. David Patteson.

Appomattox—Benj. P. Walker.

Augusta—S. B. Finley, J. Marshall McCue, William M. Tate, James Bumgardner, James Walker.

Bedford—T. T. Saunders.

Botetourt—Richard G. Haden.

Brunswick—J. Ravenscroft Jones.

Buckingham—Thomas M. Bondurant.

Campbell—Bowling Clarke.

Caroline—Daniel C. Dejarnett, Joseph Jesse.

Charles City—Hill Carter.

Charlotte—Wood Bouldin, John Marshall, Wm. T. Scott.

Clarke—Hugh M. Nelson.

Chesterfield—James C. Gates, James H. Cox, and Augustus H. Drewry.

Culpeper—Richard H. Cunningham.

Cumberland—James M. Austin, Dr. William S. Morton.

Dinwiddie—G. Hill.

Danville—Dr. Thomas P. Atkinson.

Fauquier—F. Lewis Marshall.

Fluvanna—Dr. C. C. Cocke.

Greene—Dr. John F. Early.

Goochland—William B. Stanard.

Halifax—John R. Edmunds, Thomas Watkins and Richard V. Watkins.

Hanover—Edmund Ruffin, Dr. Wm. R. Nelson, Dr. T. P. Temple.

Henrico—John R. Garnett, J. F. Childrey, Sherwin McRae, B. J. Duval, J. L. Davis.

Jefferson—Braxton Davenport.

King William—Dr. Carter W. Wormley.

King & Queen—Benjamin F. Dew.

Louisa—Clayton G. Coleman, Wm. Overton,
Dr. P. B. Pendleton.

Loudoun—Robert L. Wright.

Lunenburg—Colin Stokes, R. H. Allen.

Lynchburg—J. H. Tyree.

Madison—B. C. Conway.

Mecklenburg—William Townes and Dr. Wm.

H. Jones.

New Kent—Dr. William H. Macon.

Nelson—William Massie.

Nottoway—William C. Knight and William

R. Bland.

Orange—John Willis, James B. Newman.

Petersburg—R. O. Britton, R. Kidder Meade,

Thomas Wallace and Thomas Branch.

Pittsylvania—George Townes.

Prince Edward—Branch J. Worsham, John

A. Scott and Thomas T. Treadway.

Prince George—Edmund Ruffin, Jr.

Powhatan—Hillary Harris, Charles Selden.

Pulaski—Dr. Edwin Watson.

Richmond City—John Robertson, John A.

Meredith, L. N. Ellett, William H. Macfarland,

Corbin Warwick, William C. Allen, Wyndham

Robertson, William M. Harrison, Charles Mc-

Gruder, Robert Edmond, R. O. Haskins, R. B.

Haxall, William Palmer, L. W. Glazebrook,

John C. Hobson and John Ruthersford.

Roanoke—Charles W. Burwell.

Rockbridge—Samuel McD. Reid, Dr. Robert

R. Barton.

Spottsylvania—O. M. Crutchfield.

Wythe—Charles L. Crockett.

District No. 1.

Hampshire, Berkeley, Morgan, Hardy, Shenandoah, Page, Warren, Rappahannock,	}	Andrew Keyser.
--	---	----------------

District No. 2.

Pendleton, Bath, Highland,	}	Henry H. Fleisher.
----------------------------------	---	--------------------

District No. 6.

Fairfax, Prince William, Stafford,	}	S. T. Stuart.
--	---	---------------

District No. 7.

King George, Westmoreland,	}	Willoughby Newton.
-------------------------------	---	--------------------

District No. 9.

Northumberland, Lancaster, Middlesex, Gloucester, Matthews,	}	Fielding L. Taylor.
---	---	---------------------

District No. 10.

Accomac, Northampton, James City, Williamsburg, York, Warwick, Elizabeth City,	}	George Booker.
--	---	----------------

District No. 12.

Sussex, Surry, Greensville,	}	Nathaniel Raines.
-----------------------------------	---	-------------------

District No. 13.

Patrick, Henry, Franklin,	}	Moses G. Booth.
---------------------------------	---	-----------------

On motion of Mr. Wright of Loudoun the Assembly took a recess until 5 o'clock this afternoon.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The speaker called the Assembly to order. On the motion of Mr. Crutchfield of Spotsylvania it was,

Resolved, that a committee of three be appointed to inform the President of the Society that the Assembly has organized, and is prepared to receive any communication it may be his pleasure to make—whereupon the speaker appointed Messrs Crutchfield, Jones and Edmunds to discharge this duty.

The president of the Society, Col. Philip St. George Cocke, then appeared before the Assembly and delivered his annual address—after which, on motion of Wm. H. Macfarland of Richmond City, it was Resolved, that the communication of the President be printed for general distribution.

On motion of Mr. Newton of Westmoreland, *Resolved*, that the thanks of the Assembly be tendered to the President of the Society for the zeal, efficiency and ability with which he has discharged the duties of his office.

On motion, the Assembly adjourned to meet at 7 o'clock to morrow morning.

WEDNESDAY, 29th Oct. 1856.

The speaker presented a communication from the Secretary of the Commonwealth of Virginia, enclosing a letter from Alex. Vattemare, the agent of this Commonwealth for Internal exchanges, accompanying a case of seeds, grains and agricultural specimens collected during the universal agricultural exhibition in the city of Paris, in May and June last, and during the world's fair in 1855. Whereupon,

On motion of Mr. Edmunds the letter was referred to the Executive Committee with instructions to make a suitable acknowledgment.

The Secretary of the Society then read the

following report of the Executive Committee; which was on motion of Dr. Garnett, laid upon the table and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

Agreeably to the requirement of the amended constitution, the Executive Committee have the honor of submitting to the Farmers' Assembly their fifth annual report of the condition of the Virginia State Agricultural Society, and of their proceedings during the past year as its executive functionaries. Among the first subjects to which the attention of the Committee was directed, on entering upon their official duties, was that of the endowment of an Agricultural Professorship in one of the State Institutions of learning. This matter, by resolutions of the Society adopted at the annual meeting in 1854, had been referred to a committee charged with the duty of ascertaining "the terms and conditions on which the Society can establish at one or more of these institutions a Professorship of Agriculture, to be endowed and supported out of the funds of the Society, and to report the details of an efficient scheme for establishing such professorship. It was also made the farther duty of the committee to ascertain whether it would be practicable to make an arrangement with the authorities of such State institutions, by which one student from each Senatorial District of the State, (to be nominated by the Society,) may be admitted free of charge for college and professors' fees in the other classes of the institution while attending the lectures of the Agricultural Professor, upon furnishing proof of his inability to pay such fees.

The duty thus enjoined was promptly performed by the able committee to which it was referred, with a zeal and fidelity commensurate with their sense of the importance of the subject, as a means "of elevating the rank of the farming class of Virginia by placing the educational training of that class in future by the side of the other learned professions, and of advancing the cause of popular education, by enabling a number of poor students, while preparing themselves for the farming profession, to acquire a competent knowledge of the other branches of science without additional expense." The committee reported that "they had held a full and free conference with the Board of Visitors of the University of Virginia about the establishment of the proposed professorship—that the board expressed the most entire and earnest willingness to co-operate with the Society in advancing the cause of agricultural education, and assured the committee that they would use the authority confided to them to have the professorship established in the manner best calculated to meet the wishes and objects of the Society, and insure the farmers of Virginia a complete course of agricultural instruction upon the scale of the most rigid economy." The committee also reported a conference held with the Professors of the Va. Military Institute in reference to the proposed Professorship of Agri-

culture. "The views of the committee were met with the same liberality by the authorities of the Institute, and the same earnest desire to advance the cause of agricultural education, with which they had been received at the University of Virginia." In their conferences with both institutions, the Committee "exhibited to them a written synopsis of the subjects to be embraced in a course of Agricultural instruction, to indicate to them the extent of their demands and in order to be informed by them how far the means and methods of instruction already provided in their several institutions could be so arranged as to meet the wishes of the Society. The authorities of the University of Virginia informed the Committee that the arrangements and divisions of the several schools of that institution afforded every advantage for having engrafted on them a school of Agriculture, and that all the subjects embraced in the synopsis presented to them were already taught in their institution, except the Veterinary art, and those which would properly fall into the department of practical Husbandry. The authorities of the Virginia Military Institute could not promise so much, as there is no Law or Medical school connected with that institution, both of which would be brought into requisition if the views of the Committee are adopted." After these conferences with both of the State institutions of learning, the select Committee came to the conclusion that "it is practicable to establish a professorship of Agriculture in either of them, to be endowed and supported by the Society." But, that in view of the "greater facilities and advantages afforded by the University of Virginia for effecting that object, should the Society decide to create the Professorship, than by the Military Institute, the select Committee advised the Society to adopt a resolution, setting aside the sum of 20,000 dollars for the endowment of an Agricultural Professorship at the University of Virginia, the interest of which sum forever shall be applied to the salary, &c., of such Professor." The report was received at the annual meeting of 1855, laid upon the table, and made the order of the day for a specified time, but it so happened that the Society adjourned finally without taking any further action on the subject. At this stage of the business, the Executive Committee determined to take such action on the subject, within the scope of their powers, and not involving any pecuniary liability of the society, as might be reasonably expected to result in the accomplishment of the end in view, if not in the manner recommended, yet by some other means not less efficient. They felt in common with "many of the most ardent friends of Agricultural improvement, that the inception and development of schemes of public education, on a scale commensurate with the honor, dignity and prosperity of the State, belongs solely to the Legislature and should not be undertaken by Associations of private individuals, however imposing

in numbers and powerful in resources." The Executive Committee therefore determined to commit the subject to the consideration of the Legislature, and to invoke its timely and efficient aid in supplying the means of Agricultural education, now felt to be an urgent and immediate popular necessity. They resolved to request the select Committee, whose report was under consideration, to prepare and present to the next meeting of the Executive Committee such a memorial to the legislature as would suitably express their views on the subject.

The Chairman of that Committee courteously complied, and an able representation of the many reasons which urgently commend the subject to the nurture and patronage of the Legislature was submitted for the adoption of the Executive Committee; but upon mature reflection it was thought that courtesy towards the Board of Visitors required that the measure proposed, affecting as it does both the organization and finances of the University, should come before the Legislature through those persons who are entrusted with the guardianship of the institution. The President therefore being requested to confer with the Rector and Visitors in reference to *their* petitioning the Legislature on the subject, addressed a "respectful but urgent request to the Board of Visitors to ask of the Legislature such an appropriation of funds as would enable the Board to establish a professorship of agriculture in that Institution."

Another subject to which the attention of the Committee has been particularly directed is the policy of the inspection laws. Incipient measures were taken as far back as 1853, to investigate their operation and effects upon the agricultural and general interests of Virginia. The views embodied in the majority and minority reports, afterwards submitted,—the first of which was adopted as more strictly consonant to the opinions entertained by a majority of the Executive Committee and of the public, and the last accepted as the exponent of the views of the other members, and commanding, in respect to most of its principles and reasoning, the approbation of them all,—are both respectfully submitted to the consideration of the Assembly. These reports very clearly illustrate the inexpediency of interposing legal regulations between buyer and seller. They are shown to operate as restrictions upon trade which ought to be left free. They deprive the purchaser of the guaranty of quality, which would be otherwise required from the seller, and which a regard both for his character and interest would prompt him to assure to the purchaser, were it not that the inspection establishes an arbitrary standard which exonerates the vendor from all personal liability for defect in quality. It thus interposes a shield between him and the purchaser, and leaves him without appeal or indemnity for damage sustained in the purchase of an article which has passed the ordeal of inspection, thereby rendering nugatory and vain the only plau-

sible pretext for sustaining such enactments—the protection of buyers and sellers from fraud. The want of uniformity and equality in the operation of some of these laws, is a palpable violation of one of the cardinal principles of good government.

The inspection of guano and plaster, not to mention others, are so partial in their application as to subject the cities of Richmond and Petersburg to a burdensome excise of more than seven thousand dollars per annum, while the other commercial cities, Norfolk, Alexandria, Fredericksburg, &c., enjoy complete immunity from these discriminating exactions. Repeated applications have been made for the abolition of these inspections, as a useless tax upon Agriculture, without countervailing advantage of any kind; but these reasonable appeals to the justice of the Legislature, have been hitherto unavailing.

An application was also made to the Legislature, when last in session, to reinstate the bill appropriating one hundred thousand dollars to the Society, which had passed the Senate at the former session. This was readily accomplished through the agency of Messrs. Thompson, Craig and Ambler of the Senate, and Tomlin, Preston and Wright of the House of Delegates, all of them known to be ardent friends of agricultural improvement, whose services had been invoked by the Executive Committee; but owing to the great accumulation of business, the bill did not reach that stage in its progress through the forms of legislation, by which it could have been put upon its passage, and is therefore again included in the mass of unfinished business pending at the adjournment of the General Assembly.

Anxious for the successful inauguration of the new system proposed for the future government of the Society, the Executive Committee attended carefully to the appointment of suitable commissioners, and the devising of the various details of other necessary arrangements for conducting the election of delegates to the Farmer's Assembly. Gratifying evidence of their success is exhibited in the fact that, notwithstanding the many difficulties encountered, nearly all the districts are represented in that body, and but few vacancies arising from failure of election remain to be filled.

The schedule of premiums for the present year has undergone a careful revision and has been considerably enlarged by the introduction of many new subjects, while it has been the aim of the Committee so to apply the scale of reduction to the amounts offered, as not to exceed the probable awards, the aggregate sum usually appropriated to the distribution of prizes. The observance of strict economy in their financial administration, at all times an imperative duty is enforced by additional motives, now, that the resources of the Society are burdened with expensive preparations for the exhibition which, through the commendable liberality of her pul-

lie authorities, have been hitherto borne by the city of Richmond.

The receipts of the Society are variable and uncertain in amounts, being contingent on the success of the yearly exhibitions. The annual contributions due from members, exceeding eight thousand five hundred in number, are seldom realized from many who do not attend the fairs. Indeed, the idea extensively prevails notwithstanding the clear and explicit provisions of the constitution to the contrary, that in becoming a member of the Society the relation ceases at the end of the current year, and may be renewed or not at pleasure by paying or withholding the annual dues. Hence large arrears for the years 1854, '55, and '56, which are justly due according to the constitutional term of membership, will be a total loss to the Society to the extent that the contrary construction of the obligation of members practically prevails. It is respectfully submitted whether a change in the Constitution, limiting the term of membership to the time for which payment is made, would not, if adopted, prove an effectual remedy for this evil. The interest accruing on the investments of the Society and the receipts from old and new members attending the Fairs under the inducements offered by the very liberal discrimination of the Rail Road companies, generally, in favor of members, added to gate fees and other incidental receipts of exhibitions, have usually supplied ample means for defraying the current and contingent expenses of the Society, and sometimes exceeding them. But whether there is likely to be any excess of receipts over expenditures this year, can not now be foreseen. Such a result is not probable, owing to the extraordinary expenditures already adverted to. Should there be a deficiency, however, an unappropriated balance of the contingent fund adequate to the satisfaction of any probable demands upon it, may be resorted to—a fund which it has been the policy of the Committee to hold in reserve to cover any failure in receipts, from the ordinary sources of revenue, while all receipts in excess of such provisional reservation, have been invested in stock, and added to the permanent fund, the interest of which only is thenceforward subject to appropriation for contingent purposes.

The following is a brief synopsis of the financial operations of the Society, from its commencement to the present time.

RECEIPTS.

Total amount of Receipts since the organization of the Society. \$82,071.97

DISBURSEMENT.

In City Scrip, at par, now held as permanent investment. \$45,250

Premiums, 1853, 3248.00

Do 1854 3,707.50

Do 1855 3,812.00

10,567.50

Expenses 1853 3,853.37

Do 1854 6,829.50

Do	1855
Including	\$520 in plate 9,078.76
Do	1856
For preparation of Fair.	
Grounds,	1,031.43
	20,703.06
	76,810.56

Balance to the credit of contingent fund, 5,261.43

By a resolution of the Virginia Mechanics' Institute, the Virginia Historical and Philosophical Society and the Executive Committee of the Virginia State Agricultural Society, were invited to confer with that Institute on the subject of erecting a suitable building for the accommodation of the three Societies. The conference asked was held by sub committees deputed from each body, who agreed upon a report in the form of a joint memorial to the Council of the city of Richmond, which was accepted by the several Societies and ordered to be presented to that body. The action taken by the Council has been to refer the subject to the City Engineer, with instructions to prepare, if practicable, a plan for the erection of a building on the site of Lafayette Hall, adapted to the purposes of the three Societies, with the intention, if found suitable, to bestow the property upon them, in the manner and form set forth in the memorial, a copy of which is herewith submitted to the Assembly.

The portraits of John Taylor, of Caroline, the author of "Arator," and of Fielding Lewis, of Charles City, "the first in the State to use lime on a large scale as an improver of the soil," have been generously presented to the Society; the former by his grandson, John Taylor, jr., and the latter by Robert Douthat and seven other grandchildren of Mr. Lewis. These portraits will be preserved as grateful souvenirs of venerable names, connected with the history of Virginia Agriculture as pioneers of improvement.

All which is respectfully submitted,

BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

CHAS. B. WILLIAMS, Secretary.

R. W. N. Nowland tendered his resignation as Clerk of the Assembly, which was accepted. John G. Mosby, Jr., was then nominated for that office, and duly elected.

On motion of Mr. Nowland, it was

Resolved, that a salary of Thirty dollars per session be paid to the clerk of this Assembly as a compensation for his services.

The Assembly then went into the election of the officers of the Virginia State Agricultural Society, for the year ending 1st January, 1858. Whereupon, Mr. Cocke being nominated for reelection, and being withdrawn by Mr. Macfarland, who speaking by authority of Mr. Cocke, stated that he could not, under any circumstances, hold the office any longer, having only consented to the last election to relieve the Society

of the difficulty in its then organization of making another choice.

Mr. Edmund Ruffin of Hanover was then nominated and unanimously elected President.

The following officers were then successively elected

Vice Presidents.

1. John R. Edmunds, of Halifax.
2. Willoughby Newton, of Westmoreland.
3. Lewis E. Harvey, of Amelia.
4. Thomas L. Preston, of Washington,
5. William M. Tate, of Augusta.
6. William Townes, of Mecklenburg.
7. G. S. Meem, of Shenandoah,
8. William Massie, of Nelson.

Executive Committee.

1. William Boulware.
2. William H. Richardson,
3. Jeremiah Morton,
4. R. H. Dulany,
5. James B. Newman.
6. William C. Knight.
7. Hugh M. Nelson.
8. William M. Radford.
9. William G. Crenshaw.
10. F. G. Ruffin.

Secretary and Treasurer.

Charles B. Williams.

Mr. Ruffin, of Hanover, moved that the constitution be so amended, that no member of the State Agricultural Society, who is in arrear of payment of his dues to the Society for one entire year or more, shall be counted in fixing the amount of representation in the Farmer's Assembly of his county or town; which was on motion laid upon the table.

Mr. Marshall, of Charlotte, moved that the Constitution of the Society be so amended that the executive committee shall have power to fix by resolution the time and place of all elections for members of the Farmers' Assembly; which was, on motion, laid upon the table for the action of the next Assembly.

On motion of Mr. Randolph, of Albemarle,

Resolved, That when this Assembly adjourns, it will adjourn to meet again at 9 o'clock to-morrow morning.

On motion of Mr. Randolph, the Assembly then adjourned.

THURSDAY, Oct. 30, 1856.

The Assembly met agreeably to adjournment, and was called to order by the President.

On motion of Sherwin McRae, of Henrico, it was

Resolved, That the General Assembly of Virginia, at its next session, be requested to furnish to the executive committee of this Society as many printed copies as it may find it convenient to publish, of the Documents and Reports of the late Board of Agriculture.

The resolution offered by Mr. Edmund Ruffin

of Hanover, and laid upon the table on yesterday was taken up, and being opposed by Mr. Edmunds of Halifax, it was again laid upon the table for the action of the next Assembly, agreeably to section XI. of the Constitution; a portion of which section is in the following words, to wit:

"Amendments to this Constitution may be made by the *unanimous* vote of the Farmers' Assembly at any annual meeting; or if offered at a prior annual meeting, then by a two-thirds vote of the members in attendance.

On motion of Mr. Randolph, of Albemarle,

Resolved, That the executive committee of this Society be requested to take the necessary steps to collect through the Secretary or otherwise, all the agricultural addresses, essays, and other papers relating to agriculture that have been delivered in Virginia which they may deem worthy, with a view to their preservation and republication if hereafter determined on by the Society.

The following resolution was offered by Sherwin McRae of Henrico, to wit:

Resolved, That the Constitution of this Society be amended by the insertion of the following as one of the articles thereof:

There shall be a Board of Agriculture elected by this Assembly, composed of persons drawn from the four great local divisions recognized in the late constitution of this State, the powers and duties of which shall be prescribed by the President of this Society. The members of this Board shall be ex-officio members of this Assembly, and shall receive for their attendance and mileage such compensation as this Assembly may prescribe; which was, on motion, laid upon the table for the action of the next Assembly, agreeably to article XI. of the Constitution.

On motion of E. Ruffin, Jr., of Prince George, it was

Resolved, That so much of the President's report as refers to the laws respecting fences or enclosures and trespasses on lands be submitted to the executive committee with directions to examine into the bearing of the same on the interests of agriculture in Eastern or any other portion of Virginia, and report to the next Farmers' Assembly such recommendation as may be deemed proper and expedient.

The following resolutions offered by R. W. N. Nowland, of Albemarle, was read, and on motion, laid upon the table, viz:

1. *Resolved*, That with a view to the collection and diffusion of agricultural information, this Assembly recommend to the executive committee the organization of a corps of agricultural commissioners, whose duty it shall be to collect and forward to the office of the secretary of the Society, agricultural statistics, accounts of experiments made, the condition and estimate of growing and unsold staple crops, and such other useful agricultural information as may be within his reach.

2. That there should be at least one such

commissioner in each senatorial district of the State, having his correspondents in each magisterial district to assist him in his labors.

3. That the secretary of the Society be instructed to prepare such forms of report as will secure uniformity in these returns and enable him conveniently to throw into tabular or other condensed shape so much thereof as in his opinion will be useful and interesting to the farmers of the State when published.

4. That the returns of these commissioners should be made quarterly.

On motion of Mr. Branch, of Petersburg, it was

Resolved, That a committee of this body be appointed to examine and report on the accounts of the Treasurer and the condition of the funds of the Society.

Whereupon the speaker appointed the following gentlemen a committee to carry into effect the above resolution, viz: Thomas Branch, of Petersburg, Corbin Warwick, of Richmond, and George Townes, of Pittsylvania.

On motion of Mr. Townes, the Assembly adjourned to meet again to-morrow morning at 9 o'clock.

FRIDAY MORNING, Oct. 31, 1856.

Agreeably to adjournment the Assembly met, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The resolutions of R. W. N. Nowland, laid upon the table on yesterday, was on motion of Mr. Ruffin, of Hanover, taken up, when, after discussion, Mr. Nowland offered the following resolutions as a substitute, which were adopted, viz:

Resolved, That the executive committee be instructed to consider, digest and put into practical operation such a plan as may seem to them best suited to operate throughout Virginia for collecting and diffusing full and correct information of the condition and estimate of both the growing and unsold staple crops and the amount of the preceding year's crop, together with such other communications of a useful agricultural character as may be obtained by some general arrangement, whether of an organized body of commissioners, resident in every district of the State, or otherwise.

Resolved, That if in furtherance of this object it shall be deemed necessary to have the aid of the State commissioners of revenue to obtain general statistical reports of actual agricultural products, that the said committee shall further consider to what extent and in what manner such aid is desirable and easily practicable; and shall take such steps to induce legislative action thereupon as to them may seem proper.

Hugh M. Nelson, of Clarke, presented "a petition from sundry members of the State Agricultural Society, asking the Farmers' Assembly to make some arrangement with the railroad companies for the transportation of stock, entered for exhibition at the annual fairs, at cheap rates;" and offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That the executive committee be instructed to apply to the Board of Public Works to instruct the Directors of all the public works in which the State is a stockholder, to allow all stock and implements for exhibition at the State Fair to pass free of charge over their roads.

Mr. Edmund Ruffin, Jr., of Prince George, offered the following as a substitute to the above:

Resolved, That the executive committee be directed to investigate the subject of freights charged by railroad and transportation companies on articles and stock for exhibition, and take such steps as may be deemed expedient to reduce the charges when excessive to a reasonable point; when, after discussion, on the motion of Mr. Bondurant, of Buckingham, the resolution and substitute were laid upon the table, not to be taken up again this session.

Mr. Townes, from the committee to examine and "Report on the Accounts of the Treasurer and the condition of the Funds of the Society," presented and read the following report, viz:

"The committee to whom the resolution of the Farmers Assembly of Virginia was referred, instructing them to 'examine and report on the accounts of the Treasurer and the condition of the funds of the Agricultural Society,' have performed that duty and now respectfully report—That in their investigation they have confined their enquires and examinations to the accounts of the Treasurer subsequent to the 31st day of October, 1855, for the following reasons: First, because, up to that period his report and accounts were submitted to the executive committee and a mass meeting of the Virginia Agricultural Society, and, as your committee believe, approved. Secondly, because, two days afterwards the amended constitution of the said Society was adopted, changing the principles organizing said Society so as to require the fiscal year to terminate on the 30th day of September of each year. The adoption of the amended constitution by the Society without providing means necessary to carry all its provisions into immediate effect, induced the Treasurer to close and balance his account for the last fiscal year on the 27th October, 1856, to which period we have confined our examinations. Up to that day, your committee ascertain there had been regularly invested in the obligations of the city of Richmond the sum of \$45,250, which said obligations are now in the possession of the said Treasurer. That the amount of the contingent fund in his hands subject to the order of the executive committee is \$5,261 43, subject to a deduction of \$669 50, the amount of unpaid, and as yet, unclaimed premiums awarded by the said Society at their several Fairs held in the years 1853, 4 and 5. Assuming that these premiums will be generously relinquished by the persons to whom they were awarded, the balance of the Contingent Fund will be as above stated, otherwise that fund will be reduced to the sum of \$4,591 93.

"Your committee are not informed of any

law or rule of the Society requiring periodical statements of the finances to be presented to the President and Executive Committee, they therefore suggest the propriety of some legal enactment enforcing the presentation of quarterly statements. They are not informed that there is any law or rule requiring a committee of accounts to supervise the vouchers and books of the Society, and report their condition; They therefore likewise respectfully suggest the propriety of a law authorizing the Executive Committee to appoint such committee to perform said duties periodically.

"Your committee are informed by the Treasurer that he is preparing to adopt a system of accounts for the Society, made up of checks and balances conforming as nearly as practicable to the system adopted at the Treasury of Virginia, and your committee highly approving said system, respectfully recommend that a law of the Society be enacted requiring the same to be done in future.

"The change in the organic law of the Society has produced some confusion in the state of indebtedness to the Society, so as to make it doubtful who are legally members now, and at what time others ceased to be so,—your committee have reason to believe that in future, by the prudent measures to be adopted by your honorable body, the condition of things will be improved.

"Your committee have not been enabled to make a more thorough examination of the subjects referred to them for want of time.

Respectfully submitted,

Whereupon, on the motion of Wm. H. Macfarland, of Richmond City, it was

Resolved, that the report be referred to the Executive Committee for such action in respect thereto, as in their judgment may be expedient.

The Speaker laid before the Assembly a communication from Philip St. George Cocke, Esq., President of the Virginia State Agricultural Society, covering a letter from the Rector of the University of Va., and a resolution of the Board of Visitors, which are in the following words.

Richmond, Oct. 30th, 1856.

THE HON. WM. C. RIVES.

Speaker of the Farmers' Assembly,

Sir—I have the honor to transmit herewith a communication from the Rector and Visitors of the University, and a resolution of the Visitors thereof referring to the establishment of a school or professorship of Agriculture in the University.

I congratulate you upon the receipt of these papers in time to lay them before the Assembly at your present session; and that neither the disposition nor the power is now wanted on the part of the University to co-operate with our Society in initiating a scheme of such vast importance to the true and permanent welfare of our State.

My views upon this subject are before the Assembly in the paper which I have already had

the honor to communicate—and I can only repeat that it is my conviction that action in this great cause is demanded by every consideration which can appeal to the patriotic hearts of our farmers.

The initiative must, it seems be taken by the Assembly, if we would avoid tedious delay. As a beginning I propose to bestow Twenty Thousand Dollars of the bonds of the University bearing six percent interest, for which by law its annuity is pledged, towards the endowment of an agricultural professorship: reserving the right of nominating the professor, subject to the approval of the Visitors of the University, and at my death the nomination of the professor to be made by the Farmers' Assembly, subject to the like approval.

I desire, furthermore, to enjoy the privilege of appointing two scholars, to be educated free of tuition fees or charge, in the proposed school; and that the privilege shall vest at my death in perpetuity in the Farmers' Assembly.

This donation, (which I am prepared to make so soon as the steps to establish the professorship or school have been taken by the Farmers' Assembly and the Visitors of the University; and the same has been put upon the permanent legal footing of other professorships therein, and the professor appointed) will leave much undone in completing the proposed school and providing the means of general agricultural instruction, and I indulge the hope that state and private liberality will take up and complete the glorious enterprise.

With the highest respect,

I remain, your most obt. serv't,

PHILIP ST. GEO. COCKE,

Blenheim, (near Carter's Bridge Post Office, Albemarle Co.,) Oct. 24, 1856. }

DEAR SIR—In June, 1855, a committee from the State Agricultural Society of Virginia, attended a meeting of the Board of Visitors of the University, for the purpose of conferring with them, as to the terms and conditions, and the extent to which the University would be disposed to co-operate with the Society, in the establishment in this Institution of a *School of Agriculture*, and which the Board of Visitors were led to understand the Society wished to *endow and support, out of their ample funds*. This proposition met with the hearty and unanimous approbation of the Board, and suitable resolutions to that effect, were adopted: but no definite action was taken upon the subject, in consequence of the Board's having no power to create any new professorship in the University. But the Committee were informed that the Board of Visitors would apply to the ensuing Legislature for authority to increase the number of schools in the Institution, and if the application was successful, than they would be prepared to co-operate with the Society, in carrying out the proposed scheme of an Agricultural Professorship, it being a matter deemed

by them of vital importance, and one identified with the interests and glory of Virginia. Of this proceeding on the part of the Board of Visitors, your committee was fully apprised at the time, and the Society afterwards, by its late Rector, Mr. Cabell.

At the late session of the Legislature, the Board of Visitors were invested with full power to increase the number of schools, in the manner, and to the extent that they might deem beneficial to the State and the University. Accordingly, at the last annual meeting of the Board of Visitors in June, the subject was again taken up for consideration, and the Board unanimously expressed a decision in favor of the establishment of the school proposed by the committee of your Society, and requested the Rector to communicate with the society and to inform it that the Board were prepared to co-operate forthwith with the Society in the establishment of the proposed Professorship, upon a scale commensurate with the views of the Society, and the wants of the country. This will appear by a copy of the resolution of the Board that I now have the honor to submit, and which you will be pleased to lay before the Society at its next meeting, or those who may be authorized to act upon the subject.

It may be proper for me to apprise you that in all the proceedings on the part of the Board of Visitors, they acted under a persuasion (and after full and free conference with your committee) that it was the intention of the agricultural society, *to endow and support the school proposed out of the fund of the Society*, with any aid that the Legislature might give, and that the object of the Society was to obtain the consent of the Rector and Board of Visitors, in the establishment of an agricultural school in the University, and its co-operation in carrying it into full and successful operation.

I have the honor to be, dear sir,

With highest respect and regard,

Your ob't servant,

A. STEVENSON, Rector of U. Va.

To P. St. George Cocke, Esq. of Prest. Ag. Society of Va.

At a regular meeting of the Board of Visitors of the University of Virginia, held on the 24th day of June, the following resolution was adopted:

Resolved, That the Rector communicate with the Agricultural Society of Virginia upon the subject of the proposition heretofore made by the Society to the Board, for the establishment of a school of Agriculture in the University, and that he inform them that the Board having been invested by the Legislature with the necessary legal authority for that purpose are prepared now to co-operate with the Society in the establishment of such a school, upon a scale commensurate with the views of the Society and wants of the country.

A copy—Teste,

R. T. W. DUKE, S. V. B.

Whereupon (after the reading of the above

communication and enclosures) on the motion of Mr. Macfarland, of Richmond city, the following resolution was *unanimously* adopted:

Resolved, That for his munificent donation to agricultural education, and for the wise and patriotic dedication of it, Philip St. George Cocke, Esq., is entitled to the enduring gratitude of this Assembly, and of all good citizens, and that the Speaker communicate to Mr. Cocke the grateful acceptance by this Assembly of his noble benefaction, and the high esteem and respect entertained for him.

On motion of Wm. H. Macfarland, of Richmond,

Resolved, That the munificent donation of Philip St. George Cocke towards the foundation of an agricultural school in the University of Virginia be, and is hereby accepted.

Mr. Edmunds, of Halifax, offered the following resolution which was unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That a committee of five, composed in part of the Speaker, and of Mr. Cocke, and such others as the Speaker may select, be appointed to confer with the Visitors of the University, and to make arrangements for the establishment of a professorship of agriculture in that Institution.

On the motion of Wyndham Robertson, of Richmond, the following was adopted as an amendment, and to be added to the above resolution, viz:

"And that said committee be instructed in making arrangements for the establishment of said professorship to express the unanimous wish of the Farmers' Assembly that the name of its noble donor be connected with the chair endowed by him.

The Speaker then proceeded to appoint the remainder of the committee. The committee consists of the following gentlemen:

Hon. Wm. C. Rives,

Philip St. George Cocke,

Wm. H. Macfarland,

Willoughby Newton, and

Franklin Minor.

On motion of Wm. H. Macfarland, it was

Resolved, That the executive committee cause to be made a marble bust and a portrait of Philip St. George Cocke, Esq., to be bestowed as this body shall hereafter determine.

On motion of Mr. Macfarland,

Resolved, That the thanks of this Assembly be presented to the distinguished presiding officer, for the courtesy and ability with which he has performed his official duties.

The foregoing resolution being unanimously adopted, was reported to the Speaker, who thereupon returned his acknowledgments in graceful and impressive terms, and complimenting the Assembly on the good feeling and order which had characterized their proceedings, he expressed his confidence in the high destiny which awaited the Society, and the hope that their gains would be full, affording all manner of store, and that their cattle and sheep would bring

forth thousands, not in their streets, but on their well appointed farms.

After which, on motion of Mr. Bondurant, the Assembly adjourned *sine die*.

VA. STATE AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY. FOURTH ANNUAL EXHIBITION.

On Tuesday, October the 28th, the officers and members of the Society only, were, admitted within the show grounds. The judges of award were organized under the direction of the Chief Marshall and furnished with books, in which to record their awards. The day was occupied by the Judges in examining, comparing and deciding upon the relative merits of the various subjects for premiums submitted to their adjudication.

On Wednesday, the 29th, the grounds were opened for the admission of the public generally, and at 11 o'clock A. M. the Fair was inaugurated with prayer, by Rev. Mr. Edwards of the Methodist Church. His Excellency, the Governor of Virginia, at the request of the President, then delivered an impromptu address, at once eloquent, original, and forcible, which was received with evident satisfaction and delight by the numerous and respectful auditory, which crowded the spacious area of the large central pavillion. He said he could not but yield to the solicitation of the President to address the Society. He was about to attempt—it perhaps rashly—without previous preparation, but that mind must be dull and insensible indeed, which would not be awakened and quickened by the inspiration of the spirit of intelligence which informed the living multitude before him. For himself, he could not look upon the glorious *physique* of Virginia as there represented in the noble type of her men and women, without glowing with emotions of patriotic pride, and seeking to find utterance for the fulness of his heart in the language of gratulation. He reviewed the progress of the physical sciences since the discovery of the American Continent, providentially opened to our enterprising countrymen as the appropriate theatre for their development; spoke of the discoveries of the power of steam, of electricity, and other forces of nature through the researches of Natural Philosophy and closed with an eloquent and earnest appeal in behalf of a comprehensive system of public education by means of which the Agriculturalist, the Artizan and the Mechanic, being endued with the power of knowledge, would be able to adapt all their operations to the well-known laws of nature, and render her forces subservient to the whole economy and practical business of life.

The Horses, of which there were on exhibition an unusual number, and many rare specimens of excellence in their respective classes, were submitted to the examination of the Judges of award.

On Thursday the 30th, the trial of ploughs and of skill in ploughmanship was conducted

near the Fair Grounds and the premiums awarded. The remainder of the day was spent on the grounds in witnessing the performances upon the horse track, and in examining animals and articles on exhibition.

On Friday 31st October the President read abstracts of the report of the Judges of award, which with other reports afterwards received, are as follows:

PREMIUMS AWARDED

BRANCH I.

Experiments.

No. 6. For report of experiments on Irish Potatoes, J. L. Campbell, Washington College, \$25 00

16. For report of a series of experiments, Dr. Ro. Harrison, Prince George, 10 00

BRANCH II.

Essays.

36. For essay on the importance of alkalies and alkaline earths to agriculture, &c., Dr. Ro. Harrison, Prince George, 50 00

41. For essay on cultivation of Fruit, Dr. T. J. Pretlow, Southampton, 20 00

42. For essay on Overseers, F. G. Ruffin, Chesterfield, 20 00

43. For essay on Summer Distemper of Cows and Oxen, Dr. John P. Mettauer of Prince Edward, 20 00

51. For essay on cultivation of Indian Corn, R. W. N. Noland, Albemarle, 10 00

52. For essay on Rotation of Crops, Edward Hill, King William, 10 00

BRANCH III.

Best entire Crops of different Farms.

73. Best average product Indian Corn, Ro. M. Taylor, Henrico, 50 00

74. Best average product of wheat, Ro. M. Taylor, Henrico, 50 00

92. Best average product of Irish Potatoes, Francis Staples, Henrico, 20 00

93. Best average product of Turnips, Dr. L. B. Starke, Henrico, 20 00

BRANCH IV.

HORSES.

Thorough-Bred.—1st Class.

98. For best thorough-bred Stallion, J. M. Botts, "Revenue," 40 00

100. For 3d best thorough-bred stallion, Thomas S. Tabb, Gloucester, "Waterloo," Certificate of Merit.

101. For best thorough-bred mare, T. W. Doswell, "Nina," 20 00

102. For 2d best thorough-bred mare, Dr. A. Crump, "Camadeva," 10 00

103. For 3d best thorough-bred mare, Wm. C. Scott, "Pauline," Certificate of Merit.

104. For best entire colt foaled since January 1853, Mr. Dean, 10 00

106. For best entire colt foaled since 1st January 1855, Thos. W. Doswell, out of "Nina," by Revenue, 7 50
108. For best Filly foaled since 1st January 1854, J. M. Botts, by Revenue, 10 00
109. For best Filly foaled since 1st January 1855, Thos. Doswell, filly out of Sarah Washington, by Revenue, 7 50
110. For best foal dropped since 1st January 1856, Capt. Belcher, by Red Eye, out of a Glencoe mare, 5 00

Horse of General Utility—2nd Class.

111. For best Stallion for useful and elegant purposes combined, William C. Rives, "Emperor," Cleveland bay, imp. 40 00
112. For 2nd best Stallion for useful and elegant purposes combined, E. H. Janney, for "Madison Hunter," Loudon, 20 00
113. For 3rd best Stallion for useful and elegant purposes combined, D. P. Winfree, Certificate of Merit.
114. For best brood Mare for useful and elegant purposes combined, Robert Thompson, Richmond, 20 00
115. For 2nd best brood Mare for useful and elegant purposes combined, W. D. Mansfield, Louisa, 10 00
116. For 3rd best brood Mare for useful and elegant purposes combined, R. Edmonds, for Lila, Certificate of Merit.
117. For best entire colt foaled since 1st January 1853, W. J. Carpenter, Hanover, 10 00
118. For best entire colt foaled since 1st January 1854, W. C. Archer, 10 00
119. For best entire colt foaled since 1st January 1855, R. Edmunds, for br. colt, 7 50
122. For best Filly foaled since 1st January 1855, R. Edmunds, for black filly, 7 50
123. For best foal dropped since 1st January 1856, R. Sampson, by Emperor, 5 00
- A. For best harness Gelding, Stebbins & Miller, "Roan Pet," 15 00
- B. 2nd best single harness Gelding, Sam'l B. Finley, 10 00
- C. For best pair matched horses, Mowry & Byars, 25 00
- D. For 2nd best pair matched horses, J. G. Jefferson, Amelia, 10 00
- E. For 3rd best pair matched horses, J. T. Foster, black horses, Certificate of Merit.
- F. For best single harness mare, G. W. Munford, jr., for Phillis, 10 00

Quick Draught Horses.—3d Class.

H. J. Smith exhibited his horse Kossuth, which the Committee on Quick Draught Horses regarded as *the best on exhibition*, but having received two premiums from the Society, he was thereby debarred from taking another. The Committee, according to the rules, award him this testimonial of continued superiority.

124. For best Stallion for quick draught Dickinson & Felton, Morgan, "Black Hawk," 40 00
125. For 2d best Stallion for quick draught, Jas. P. Machen, for "Belfounder," 20 00
127. For best brood mare for quick draught, W. J. McCloy, "Nanny Wickham," 20 00
128. For 2d best brood mare for quick draught, John Allen, "Lady Clifford," 10 00
129. For 3d best brood mare for quick draught, S. Scherer, "Nanny Bell,"

Certificate of Merit.

130. For best entire colt foaled since 1st January 1853, W. J. Carpenter, "Ticonderoga," 10 00
131. For best entire colt foaled since 1st January 1854, H. McKinster, "Chieftain," Fauquier, 10 00
132. For best entire colt foaled since 1st January 1855, W. P. Braxton, by "Kossuth," 7 50
134. For best Filly foaled since 1st January 1854, A. Kerr, by Kossuth, 10 00
135. For best Filly foaled since 1st January 1855, Wm. W. Fulcher of Hanover, 7 50
136. For best foal dropped since 1st January 1856, Richard Sampson, by Emperor, 5 00
137. For best pair matched horses for quick draught, J. Maben Hobson, Goochland, 25 00
138. For 2d best pair matched horses for quick draught, J. T. Foster, 10 00
139. For the best single harness horse, mare or gelding, S. S. Ayer, Northampton, 15 00
140. For 2d best single harness horse, mare or gelding, D. J. Spratley, Surry, 10 00

Heavy Draught Horses.—4th Class.

141. For best Stallion for heavy draught, H. M. Nelson, "Tramper," bay horse, 40 00
142. For 2nd best Stallion for heavy draught, N. Berkeley, "Robin," g. horse, 20 00
143. For 3rd best Stallion for heavy draught, R. Y. & W. Overby, "Black Hawk," Certificate of Merit.
154. For best pair heavy draught horses, C. B. Turner, 20 00
155. For best team heavy draught horses, J. P. Ballard, 30 00

Saddle-Horses.—5th Class.

156. For best Stallion for the saddle, Bushrod Grigsby, "Saltram," 40 00
157. For 2nd best Stallion, for the saddle, F. G. Carter, "Rob Roy," 20 00
158. For 3rd best Stallion, for the saddle, C. B. Hamilton, "Snap," Certificate of Merit.
159. For best brood mare, for saddle, H. M. Fowlkes, Chesterfield, 20 00

160. For 2nd best brood mare, for the saddle, B. Hatcher, Chesterfield,	10 00	200. For 2nd best Cow, 3 years old and upwards, A. G. Davis, Loudoun, "Cherry,"	15 00
162. For best entire colt, foaled since 1st January, 1853, Landon C. Edmunds, Bay colt by Messinger,	10 00	201. For 3rd best Cow, 3 years old and upwards, Thomas A. Hardy, "Maggie,"	Certificate of Merit.
163. For best entire colt, foaled since 1st January, 1854, Jno. Hooper, Buckingham,	10 00	202. For best Bull, between 2 and 3 years old, A. G. Davis, "Billy,"	15 00
166. For best entire colt foaled since 1st January 1854, Charles H. Rhodes, Chesterfield,	10 00	203. For 2nd best Bull, between 2 and 3 years old, A. Garrett, Richmond, "Harrold,"	8 00
167. For best Filly, foaled since 1st January, 1855, Alex. Kerr, Richmond,	7 50	205. For best Bull, between 1 and 2 years old, T. W. Stonestreet, Maryland, "Star,"	15 00
169. For best saddle horse, mare or gelding, E. H. Janney, Loudoun,	20 00	206. For 2nd best Bull, between 1 and 2 years old, Dr. P. B. Pendleton, Louisa, "Baltimore,"	8 00
170. For 2nd best saddle horse, mare or gelding, Jno. Hayden, Spottsylvania,	10 00	207. For best heifer, between 2 and 3 years old, J. C. R. Taylor, Albemarle, "Charlotte,"	15 00
<i>Mules and Jacks.—6th Class.</i>			
171. For the best Jack, Dr. Jno. T. Minor, Stafford,	40 00	208. For 2nd best heifer, between 2 and 3 years old, Dr. T. J. Wooldridge Hanover, "Rosebud,"	8 00
172. For 2nd best Jack, Lewis Graves, Orange,	20 00	209. For best heifer, between 1 and 2 years old, A. G. Davis, "Jenny,"	15 00
173. For the best Jennet, B. W. Green, Henrico,	20 00	210. For 2nd best heifer, between 1 and 2 years old, Jas. S. Oden, Loudoun, "Nancy,"	8 00
174. For 2nd best Jennet, B. W. Green, Henrico,	10 00	196½. For best Alderney Bull, James P. Machen, "Poquennoek,"	30 00
175. For best pair Mules, owned and worked one year preceding their exhibition, H. T. Taliaferro,	15 00	197½. For best Alderney Cow, John G. Turpin,	30 00
176. For the best team of Mules, four or more, owned and worked one year preceding exhibition, L. D. Crenshaw, Richmond,	25 00	The Committee take pleasure in reporting that the exhibition of "Devons" on the present occasion is very fine. The character of the stock being of the highest order of excellence, they found great difficulty in deciding on their merits.	

CATTLE.

Short Horns or Durhams, and Herefords.
1st Class.

184. For the best Cow, R. H. Dulany, "Aurora,"	30 00
185. For 2nd best Cow, R. H. Baptist, "Mary Foot,"	15 00
187. For best Bull, between 2 and 3 years old, N. Berkeley, "Demosthenes,"	15 00
188. For 2nd best, between 2 and 3 years old, L. H. Dance, "Lord Barrington,"	8 00
194. For best heifer, between 1 and 2 years old, R. H. Dulany, imported,	15 00
195. For 2nd best heifer, between 1 and 2 years old, R. H. Dulany, imported,	8 00

Devons and Alderneys.—2nd Class.

196. For best Bull, 3 years old and upwards, Thos. A. Hardy, Norfolk, "Ben Bolt,"	39 00
197. For 2nd best Bull, 3 years old and upwards, W. Dozier, Princess Anne, "Tecumseh,"	15 00
198. For 3rd best Bull, 3 years old and upwards, R. J. T. White, Hillsborough, "Hanover,"	Certificate of Merit.
199. For best Cow, 3 years old and upwards, Thos. A. Hardy, Norfolk, "Lucy,"	30 00

Ayrshires and Holsteins.—3d Class.

223. For the best Ayrshire Bull, between 1 and 2 years old, Thomas Betts, England,	15 00
--	-------

Natives or Grades.—4th Class.

227. For best Bull, 3 years old and upwards, Richard D. Carter, New Kent,	15 00
228. For 2nd best Bull, 3 years old and upwards between S. W. Ficklin and P. St. George Cock, for "Melbourn and Paul Pry,"	10 00
229. For 3rd best Bull, 3 years old and upwards, Dr. John R. Woods, "John,"	Certificate of Merit.
230. For best Bull, between 2 and 3 years old, S. W. Ficklin, "Belmont,"	10 00
231. For 2nd best bull, between 2 and 3 years old, Wm. C. Rives, "Romeo,"	5 00
233. For best Bull, between 1 and 2 years old, Wm. C. Rives, "Carnwath,"	10 00
234. For 2nd best Bull, between 1 and 2 years old, T. A. Hardy, "Norfolk,"	5 00
235. For best Cow, 3 years old and upwards, R. H. Dulany,	30 00
236. For 2nd best Cow, 3 years old and upwards, S. W. Ficklin, "Sally,"	15 00

237. For 3rd best Cow 3 years old and upwards, Thomas A. Hardy, "Dairy Maid," Certificate of Merit.

238. For best Heifer between 2 and 3 years old, S. W. Ficklin, "Lizzie," 10 00

239. For 2nd best Heifer between 2 and 3 years old, T. A. Hardy, "Pink," 5 00

240. For 3d best Heifer between 2 and 3 years old, S. W. Ficklin; "Eve," Certificate of Merit.

241. For best Heifer between 1 and 2 years old, T. A. Hardy, "Betty," 10 00

242. For 2d best Heifer between 1 and 2 years old, Dr. T. J. Wooldridge, "Zaidee," 5 00

Dairy Cows—5th Class.

244. For 2nd best Cow for the dairy, Joseph Vandeventer, Henrico, "Mary," 15 00

Working Oxen—6th Class.

245. For best yoke of trained Oxen over 4 years old, F. Bell, Augusta, 30 00

246. For 2d best yoke of trained Oxen over 4 years old, Reuben Newman, Jr., Orange, 15 00

Fat Stock—7th Class.

249. For best pair aged fat Steers, Joseph Cloyd, Pulaski, 40 00

250. For 2nd best pair aged fat Steers, Joseph Cloyd, Pulaski, 25 00

251. For best pair fat Steers under 4 years old, D. McGavock, Pulaski, 40 00

252. For 2d best pair fat Steers under 4 years old, Joseph Cloyd, Pulaski, 25 00

253. For best fat Cow over 4 years old, James R. Kent, Montgomery, 20 00

257. For best single fat Steer, W. B. and J. M. Byars, 15 00

258. For 2d best single fat Steer, Jas. Walker, Augusta, 10 00

8th Class.

261. For best slaughtered Mutton of fine wools, P. B. Jones, Orange, 5 00

262. For best slaughtered Mutton of middle wools, J. M. McCue, Augusta, 5 00

263. For best slaughtered Mutton of long wools, J. M. McCue, Augusta, 5 00

The Committee on Fat Stock desire to say that the exhibition of *Fat Cattle* was highly creditable, and request the publication of the fact.

SHEEP—FINE WOOLS.

Merinos—3rd Class.

280. For best Buck, S. S. Bradford, of Culpeper, 20 00

281. For 2d best Buck, S. S. Bradford, Culpeper, 10 00

282. For 3d best Buck, S. S. Bradford, Culpeper, Certificate of Merit.

283. For best pen of Ewes, 3 in number, S. S. Bradford, Culpeper, 20 00

284. For 2nd best pen of Ewes, 3 in number, S. S. Bradford, Culpeper, 10 00

285. For 3rd best pen of Ewes, 3 in number, S. S. Bradford, Culpeper, Certificate of Merit.

286. For best pen of Ewe lambs, 4 in number, S. S. Bradford, Culpeper, 10 00

296. For the best Buck, R. H. Dulaney, Loudoun, 20 00

297. For the 2nd best Buck, R. H. Dulaney, Loudoun, 10 00

299. For best pen of Ewes, 3 in number, R. H. Dulaney, Loudoun, 20 00

300. For 2nd best pen of Ewes, 3 in number, R. H. Dulaney, Loudoun, 10 00

303. For best pen of Buck lambs, 4 in number, R. H. Dulaney, Loudoun, 10 00

South Down Grades—6th Class.

310. For best pen of Ewe lambs, 4 in number, J. F. Wickham, Hanover, 10 00

311. For best pen of Buck lambs, 4 in number, J. F. Wickham, Hanover, 5 00

Oxford Downs—7th Class.

312. For the best Buck, Wm. C. Rives, Albemarle, "Earl of Oxford," 20 00

313. For 2d best Buck, Wm. C. Rives, Albemarle, "Earl of Albemarle," 10 00

Oxford Down Grades—8th Class.

323. For best pen of Ewes, 3 in number, Wm. C. Rives, Albemarle, 20 00

324. For 2nd best pen of Ewes, 3 in number, Wm. C. Rives, Albemarle, 10 00

326. For best pen of Ewe lambs, 4 in number, Wm. C. Rives, Albemarle, 10 00

327. For best pen of Buck lambs, 4 in number, Wm. C. Rives, Albemarle, 5 00

Long Wools—9th Class.

328. For best Cotswold Buck, } Suspend'd for

329. For 2nd best Buck, } decision by

330. For 3rd best Buck, } Ex. Com.

331. For best pen of Ewes, 3 in number, J. W. Ware, Clarke, 20 00

332. For 2nd best pen of Ewes, 3 in number, J. W. Ware, Clarke, 10 00

333. For 3rd best pen of Ewes, 3 in number, J. W. Ware, Clarke, Certificate of Merit.

334. For best pen of Buck lambs, 4 in number, J. W. Ware, Clarke, 10 00

335. For best pen of Ewe lambs, 4 in number, J. W. Ware, Clarke, 10 00

Long Wool Grades—10th Class.

339. For best pen of Ewes, 3 in number, J. W. Ware, Clarke, 20 00

340. For 2nd best pen of Ewes, 3 in number, J. W. Ware, Clarke, 10 00

342. For best pen of Buck lambs, 4 in number, J. W. Ware, Clarke, 5 00

343. For best pen of Ewe lambs, 4 in number, J. W. Ware, Clarke, 10 00

Cross Breeds—11th Class.

344. For the best Buck, Dr. John R. Woods, Albemarle, 20 00

345. For the 2nd best Buck, J. W. Ware, Clarke, 10 00
 346. For the 3rd best Buck, E. Fontaine, Hanover, Certificate of Merit.
 347. For the best pen of Ewes, 3 in number, J. R. Woods, Albemarle, 20 00
 348. For the 2nd best pen of Ewes, 3 in number, J. W. Ware, Clarke, 10 00
 349. For the 3rd best pen of Ewes, 3 in number, J. W. Ware, Clarke, Certificate of Merit.

350. For the best pen of Ewe lambs, 4 in number, Dr. J. R. Woods, Albemarle, 10 00
 351. For the best pen of Buck lambs, 4 in number, Dr. John R. Woods, Albemarle, 10 00

The Committee on middle wool sheep take great pleasure in bearing testimony to the rare excellency of some of the animals on exhibition, especially those imported by Mr. Rives and Mr. Dulany.

Foreign Sheep.—12th Class.

360. For best imported Southdown buck, R. H. Dulany, Loudoun, \$20 00
 361. For 2nd best imported Southdown buck, Thomas Betts, England, 10 00
 364. For best imported Oxford down buck, William C. Rives, Albemarle, 20 00
 366. For best imported Oxford down ewe, William C. Rives, 20 00
 367. For 2nd best imported Oxford down ewe, William C. Rives, 10 00
 372. For best imported Cotswold or New Oxfordshire buck, J. W. Ware, Clarke, 20 00
 373. For 2nd best imported Cotswold or New Oxfordshire buck, J. W. Ware, 10 00
 374. For best imported Cotswold or New Oxfordshire ewe, J. W. Ware, 20 00
 375. For 2nd best imported Cotswold or New Oxfordshire ewe, J. W. Ware, 10 00

Swine.—Large Breed.

378. For best boar over two years old, R. D. Carter, New Kent, 20 00
 379. For 2nd best boar over 2 years old, Peyton Johnson, Henrico, 10 00
 380. For the best boar 1 year old, J. Sinton and Sons, Henrico, 15 00
 381. For 2nd best boar 1 year old, S. W. Ficklin, Albemarle, 8 00
 382. For best breeding sow over 2 years old, J. G. Turpin, Chesterfield, 20 00
 383. For 2nd best breeding sow over 2 years old, J. B. Yates, Falmouth, Stafford, 10 00
 384. For best sow not less than six months and under eighteen months old, S. W. Ficklin, Albemarle, 15 00
 385. For 2nd best sow not less than 6 months and under 18 months old, S. W. Ficklin, Albemarle, 8 00
 386. For best lot of pigs, not less than 5 in number, nor less than 2, and under 5 months old, S. W. Ficklin, Albemarle, 10 00

387. For 2nd best lot of pigs not less than 5 in number, nor less than 2, and under 5 months old, Dr. John R. Woods, Albemarle, 5 00

Small Breed.

388. For the best boar over 2 years old, Thomas A. Hardy, Norfolk, \$15 00
 389. For 2nd best boar over 2 years old, Thomas A. Hardy, Norfolk, 8 00
 390. For best boar over 1 year old, Thomas A. Hardy, Norfolk, 15 00
 391. For 2nd best boar over 1 year old, Thomas A. Hardy, Norfolk, 8 00
 392. For best breeding sow over 2 years old, J. G. Turpin, Chesterfield, 15 00
 393. For 2nd best breeding sow over 2 years old, R. H. Dulany, Loudoun, 8 00
 394. For the best sow, not less than 6 months, nor more than 18 months old, Thomas A. Hardy, Norfolk, 15 00
 395. For 2nd best sow, not less than 6 months, nor more than 18 months old, T. J. Wooldridge, Hanover, 8 00
 396. For best lot of pigs not less than 5 in number, nor less than 2, and under 5 months old, R. H. Dulany, Loudoun, 10 00
 397. For 2nd best lot of pigs, not less than 4 in number, nor less than 2, and under 5 months old, Thomas A. Hardy, Norfolk, 5 00

Additional Premiums to Premium Animals.

398. For best bull of 3 years old or more of any breed on exhibition, Mr. Hardy's Ben Bolt, Devon,
 399. For best ewe of any breed on exhibition, Mr. Dulany,
 400. For best stallion of any breed on exhibition, Mr. Botts' Revenue,
 401. For best brood mare of any breed on exhibition, Thos. W. Doswell—Nina,
 402. For best buck of any breed on exhibition, Mr. Dulany—S. D. Buck,
 403. For best ewe of any breed on exhibition, J. W. Ware, Imported Cotswold,
 404. For best boar of any breed on exhibition, P. Johnson, Chester Boar, Dick,
 405. For the best breeding sow of any breed on exhibition, Mr. Turpin, Suffolk sow.

In submitting the foregoing award, the Committee acknowledge that they met with great difficulty in arriving at conclusions satisfactory to themselves and doing justice to the very fine stock which was exhibited to their inspection. The comparison of animals, when several specimens of different kinds were nearly or quite perfect, almost resolves itself into a disquisition and examination of the relative excellencies and comparative value of the different kinds. The South Down sheep of Mr. Dulany, the Cotswold sheep of Col. Ware, and the Oxford Down sheep of Mr. Rives are considered by the Committee as perfect and unsurpassed specimens of this

Certificate of Merit.

most useful animal, and of such an equality of excellency, size and form, that they all deserve the highest commendation. These gentlemen really deserve the thanks of the commonwealth of Virginia for their public spirit and liberality in importing the best animals alone, and ought to be esteemed as public benefactors.

The Committee beg leave to call attention to another fact that must have been noticed by many—*i. e.* the great and wonderful improvement made by crossing the tups of these different families on our native sheep. The show of Devons was superior to all previous exhibitions in our State, while there was a manifest deterioration and falling off in the Durhams and Alderneys. Among the Devons were many very fine animals.

In the Hog department the Committee saw many fine, large and well-shaped animals, but would rather discourage than commend so much crossing. In crossing animals it is notorious that nearly all the bad qualities of both parents are usually transmitted to the progeny to the exclusion of the good qualities.

It is true often a very superior animal is produced, but then he cannot be relied on for any thing, some of his offsprings taking after one and some after the other branch of his family. A cross on our native stock produces some amelioration, but we cannot rely on such crosses for permanent improvement.

The Horse department presented a great variety of excellent animals for the different purposes to which this noble animal is made subservient. The show of blood horses and mares was not extensive, and with one or two exceptions, much below what we expected to find, but this deficiency was in a great measure compensated by the extensive and excellent exhibition of horses for nearly all other purposes.

Poultry. Chickens.—1st Class.

406. For the best pair white Shanghais, C. J. Merriwether,	2 00
409. For best pair yellow Shanghais, J. Porter.	2 00
413. For best pair gray Chitagongs, J. Porter,	2 00
419. For best pair white or red Game, James Duke,	2 00
420. For best pair Bramah Pootra, J. G. Turpin,	2 00
422. For best pair black Spanish, J. G. Turpin,	2 00
428. For best pair Sea Bright Bantams, J. G. Turpin,	2 00
429. For best pair Java Bantams, Richard Forrester,	2 00
A. For best game Cock, A. H. Garrett,	2 00
B. Pair Game Fowls, "Earl Derby," J. McL. Anderson, Caroline,	2 00
C. Pair White and Red Bantam, J. G. Turpin,	2 00
D. Game Fowls, James Duke,	2 00

E. "Hancock Game,"	"	
A. G. Elam,		2 00
F. "Henney and Christian Game,"		
Jesse Baker,		2 00
G. "Black Suwarrow," William Brittain,		2 00

Turkeys—2nd Class.

433. For best pair common Turkeys,		
J. G. Turpin,		\$2 00
434. For best pair wild Turkeys, J. G. Turpin,		2 00
435. For best pair crested Turkeys, J. G. Turpin,		2 00

Geese—3rd Class.

437. For best pair wild Geese, J. G. Turpin,		\$2 00
438. For best pair China Geese, J. G. Turpin,		2 00
439. For best pair Bremen Geese, Mrs. B. W. Green,		2 00
440. For best pair Poland Geese, W. D. Jennings,		2 00

Ducks—4th Class.

443. For best pair Salem Ducks, Geo. H. King, Henrico,		2 00
444. For best pair Alesbury Ducks, J. G. Turpin,		2 00
445. For best pair common Ducks, Wm. Brittain,		2 00
447. For greatest variety of Poultry, by one Exhibitor, J. G. Turpin,		10 00

BRANCH V.

Agricultural Implements—Ploughs, Cultivators, &c.—Class 1.

448. For the best single Plough, Geo. Watt & Co., Richmond,		\$5 00
449. For best shovel Plough, F. Nelson, Richmond,		5 00
450. For best sub-soil Plough, Geo. Watt & Co., Richmond,		5 00
451. For best new ground Plough, Geo. Watt & Co., Richmond,		5 00
452. For best hill side Plough, F. Nelson, Richmond,		5 00
453. For best Cultivator for corn, A. P. Routt, Orange,		5 00
455. For best cultivator for 2 horses, Sinclair & Co., Baltimore,		5 00
456. For best harrow, H. M. Smith, Richmond,		6 00
457. For best swingle bars of novel construction and superior value to those in common use, F. Nelson, Richmond,		3 00

Drills and Broadcasters—Class 2nd.

458. For best broadcasting or drilling machine for sowing grain and grass seed		
D. C. Meade, Semour's Patent,		\$20 00
459. For best wheat drill, Bickford & Huffman,		20 00
460. For best broadcasting machine for sowing guano, Baldwin, Cardwell, & Co., Richmond,		20 00

461. For best lime spreader, H. M. Smith, Richmond, 20 00
 462. For best corn planter, A. P. Routt, Orange, 10 00
 463. For best seed drill, A. P. Routt, 3 00
 464. For best attachment to drill for drilling guano, Edward Hunt, Campbell, 15 00
 465. For best implement for sowing peas among corn, at or immediately following the last tillage, and either with or without guano, Edward Hunt, Campbell, 15 00

Wagons, Harness, &c.—Class 3rd.

466. For best Wagon for farm use, H. M. Smith, Richmond, \$10 00
 470. For best wagon body for hauling wheat in sheaf, or hay, or straw, H. M. Smith, Richmond, 5 00
 474. For best Ox yoke, F. Nelson, Richmond, 1 50

Rollers and Clod Crushers—Class 4th.

475. For best smooth roller, H. M. Smith, Richmond, \$10 00
 477. For best clod crusher, Baldwin, Cardwell & Co., Croskill's, 20 00

Horse Powers, Threshers and Separators. Class 5th.

479. For best sweep horse power, H. M. Smith, Richmond, \$25 00
 480. For 2nd best sweep horse power, Baldwin, Cardwell, & Co., Richmond, 10 00
 481. For best threshing machine, Baldwin, Cardwell, & Co., Richmond, 20 00
 482. For best machine for threshing, cleansing and separating wheat at one operation, H. M. Smith, Richmond, 30 00
 483. For best separator or straw carrier, Baldwin, Cardwell, & Co., Richmond, 5 00

The Committee on Class 5 found great difficulty in deciding whether the horse power of H. M. Smith, to which they have awarded the first Premium or that of Messrs. Baldwin, Cardwell & Co. to which they have awarded the second premium was the best Power. They thought Messrs. Baldwin, Cardwell & Co.'s the strongest, but that H. M. Smith's was the smoothest of the two, giving more power with a lighter draught, and therefore have awarded to him the first Premium.

Straw and Root Cutters, Cornshellers and Mills. Class 6th.

484. For best hay or straw cutter for horse power, Sinclair & Co., Baltimore, \$10 00
 485. For best hay or straw cutter, for hand power, J. L. Richmond, Harrisburg, Pa., 5 00
 486. For best horse power cutter, for cutting corn stalks for fodder, Sinclair & Co., Baltimore, 15 00
 487. For best corn sheller for horse power, Sinclair & Co., Baltimore, 10 00

488. For best corn sheller for hand power, H. M. Smith, Richmond, 5 00
 489. For best Grist Mill for horse power, Sinclair & Co., 10 00
 490. For best hominy mill, J. L. Gilbert, Petersburg, 5 00
 491. For best saw mill for farm use, P. Rahm, Richmond, 10 00
 492. For best corn and cob crusher, Cresson, Stewart, & Peterson, Philadelphia, 10 00
 493. For best Root Cutter, H. M. Smith, Richmond, 2 50

Fan Mill, Hay Press, &c.—Class 7th.

494. For best Fanning Mill, Montgomery & Bro, Baltimore, 10 00
 495. For best hay press, Baldwin, Cardwell & Co., Richmond, 15 00

Trial of Ploughs—Class 8th.

500. For best two horse plough for sandy land, as shown by work actually performed and the test of the dynamometer, Baldwin, Cardwell, & Co., Richmond, for Richie's left hand iron plough, 20 00
 501. For best two horse plough for clay land, as shown by work actually performed and the test of the dynamometer, Burns & Shuff, Goochland, 20 00
 502. For best 3 or 4 horse plough for sandy land, as shown by work actually performed and the test of the dynamometer, Wilson & Smithers, Goochland, 20 00
 503. For best 3 or 4 horse plough for clay land, as shown by work actually performed and the test of the dynamometer, Burns & Shuff's, Goochland, 20 00

Miscellaneous—Class 9th.

509. For best apple peeler, J. Harold, Richmond, 1 00
 510. For best meat cutter, H. M. Smith, Richmond, 2 00
 511. For best washing machine, W. H. & R. B. Woodward, Richmond, 2 00
 514. For the most extensive and valuable collection of useful machines and implements exhibited and made at any one factory, whether including subjects for other premiums or not, H. M. Smith, Richmond, 25 00

Agricultural Steam Engine.

515. For best Steam Engine, (on wheels), applicable to Agricultural purposes generally, as a substitute for horse power, Talbott & Brother, Richmond, 50 00

Ploughing Match—Class 10th.

516. For best ploughman with horses, Richard Sampson's man Randolph, 10 00
 517. For 2nd best ploughman with horses, James Shepperson, Henrico, 5 00

BRANCH VI.

Fruits and Fruit Trees.

521. For best and largest variety of apples, suitable for Southern raising, each labelled, Dr. A. Dold, Augusta, \$10 00
524. For best and largest collection of apple trees, suitable for Southern raising, Joseph Sinton & Sons, 10 00
525. For best pear trees, Henry R. Roby, Spottsylvania, 10 00
526. For best peach trees, Franklin Davis, Augusta, 10 00
527. For best fig trees, James Guest, Henrico, 5 00
529. For best strawberry vines, James Guest, Henrico, 3 00
530. For best raspberry plants, Jos. Sinton & Sons, Henrico, 3 00

Flowers.

531. For largest and choicest variety of flowers, Jno. Morton, Richmond, \$10 00
532. For 2nd, largest and choicest variety of Flowers, James Guest, Henrico, 5 00
533. For best and greatest variety of dahlias, James Guest, Henrico, 5 00
534. For best and greatest variety of roses, Jno. Morton, Richmond, 5 00
535. For best floral ornament, Jno. Morton, Richmond, 5 00
536. For best and largest variety of greenhouse plants, James Guest, Henrico, 5 00

Vegetables.

537. For largest and best assortment of table vegetables, Leonard Chamberlain, \$10 00
538. For best doz. long blood beets, Leonard Chamberlain, 2 00
539. For best doz. head of cabbage, Joseph Rennie, 2 00
540. For best doz. cauliflower, E. Shuter, 2 00
541. For best doz. Broccoli, E. Shuter, 2 00
542. For best doz. carrots, E. Shuter, 2 00
543. For best doz. egg plants, Leonard Chamberlain, 2 00
544. For best peek of onions, P. M. Tabb, Jr., 2 00
545. For best doz. parsnips, T. C. Burns, 2 00
546. For best bushel Irish potatoes, Francis Staples, 2 00
547. For best bushel sweet potatoes, Wm. Gouldin, Hanover, 2 00

BRANCH VII.

Butter and Cheese.

548. For best specimen of fresh butter, not less than ten pounds, half Mrs. A. Goddin, New Kent, and half Mrs. C. S. Gay, Augusta, \$10 00

549. For 2nd best specimen of fresh butter, not less than five pounds, Mrs. Newnan, Orange, and Mrs. Mary Fulcher, Hanover, 5 00

Honey, Bee-Hives and Bacon Hams.

553. For best specimen of honey, not less than ten pounds, P. J. Mahan, \$ 5 00
554. For best bee hive, P. J. Mahan, 10 00
555. For best ham cured by exhibitor, Mrs. Lucy C. Binford, Hanover, 8 00
556. For 2nd best ham cured by exhibitor, Mrs. P. Woolfolk, Caroline, 4 00

Household Manufactures.—Class 1.

557. For best quilt, Mrs. Wm. E. Clouton, New Kent, \$5 00
558. For 2nd best quilt, Mrs. W. E. Woodson, Henrico, 4 00
559. For the best counterpane, Mrs. M. M. Jewry, Charlottesville, 5 00
560. For 2nd best counterpane, Miss M. Fontaine, Richmond, 4 00
561. For best pair home-made blankets, Wm. Rodes, Albemarle, 5 00
562. For best home-made carpet, Mrs. Geo. Townes, Pittsylvania, 5 00
563. For best home-made hearth-rug, Miss M. Fontaine, Richmond, 3 00
566. For best piece, not less than 7 yards, home-made negro shirting, Mrs. Henry Cox, Henrico, 3 00
567. For best piece, not less than ten yards, winter clothing for negroes, woven by hand, Mrs. J. M. Patterson, Buckingham, 5 00
568. For best piece, not less than ten yards, heavy woolen jeans, woven by hand, Mrs. Isham Seay, Cumberland, 5 00
570. For best piece linsey, not less than seven yards, woven by hand, Mrs. R. H. Allen, Lunenburg, 5 00
571. For 2nd best piece linsey, not less than seven yards, woven by hand, Mrs. J. M. Patteson, Buckingham, 3 00

Class 2nd.

572. For best fine long yarn hose, Mrs. Jonah Johnson, Spottsylvania, \$3 00
574. For best silk hose, of home-made silk, Mrs. L. J. Hollingsworth, Winchester, 5 00
575. For best specimen of home-made wine, Mrs. W. D. Blanton, Cumberland, 5 00
576. For best home-made bread, between Mrs. Rodes and Mrs. S. J. Rutherford, 5 00
577. For best home-made pound-cake, Mrs. Rich'd Crouch, 3 00
578. For best home-made sponge cake, Mrs. Rich'd Crouch, 3 00
579. For best varieties home-made pickles, Mrs. James Ayres, Petersburg, 3 00
580. For best varieties home-made preserves, Mrs. Henry Cox, Henrico, 3 00

581. For best varieties home-made fruit jelly, Mrs. Henry Cox, Henrico, 3 00
 582. For best sample home-made soap, the process of making to be described by exhibitor, Mrs. C. J. Stovin, Fauquier, 5 00

Class 3rd.—Ladies Ornamental and Fancy Work.

583. For best specimen of embroidery, Mrs. Sarah B. Scott, Dinwiddie, \$8 00
 584. For 2nd best specimen of embroidery, L. B. Conway, Richmond, 6 00
 585. For 3rd best specimen of embroidery, Miss L. Manson, Bedford, 4 00
 586. For best specimen of worsted work, Miss Dietrick, Henrico, 8 00
 587. For 2nd best specimen of worsted work, Miss Agnes Walthall, Charlottesville, 6 00
 588. For 3rd best specimen of worsted work, Mrs. J. W. Walker, Richmond, 4 00
 589. For best specimen of crocheted work, Mrs. Goodson, Richmond, 8 00
 590. For 2nd best specimen of crocheted work, Miss Fox, Richmond, 6 00
 591. For 3rd best specimen of crocheted work, Mrs. Waddell, Richmond, 4 00
 592. For best specimen of wax work, Master Herbert Smith, 8 00
 598. For best specimen of ornamental leather work, Miss Ella Dimmock, 8 00
 599. For 2nd best specimen of ornamental leather work, Miss Ella Dimmock, 6 00
 600. For 3rd best specimen of ornamental leather work, Miss A. M. Smith, 4 00
 601. For best specimen of Block work, Miss Kate Anderson, 8 00
 604. For best specimen of knitting, Mrs. Sarah Bernard, Richmond, 8 00
 605. For 2nd best specimen of knitting, Miss Peterkin, Richmond, 6 00
 606. For 3rd best specimen of knitting, Mrs. R. S. Archer, 4 00
 607. For best specimen of netting, Miss Isabella Gray, Port Royal, 8 00
 608. For 2nd best specimen of netting, Mrs. P. Woolfolk, Caroline, 6 00
 609. For 3rd best specimen of netting, Mrs. P. Woolfolk, Caroline, 4 00
 610. For the most extensive variety of useful, ornamental and fancy work, not excluding articles which may have had premiums awarded them under any of the above specifications, Mrs. Sarah B. Scott, Dinwiddie, 10 00

Domestic Manufactures.—1st Class.

611. For best Family Flour, "Valley Mills," P. O. Palmer, exhibited by Matthew Blair, Richmond, Certificate of Merit.

2nd Class.

612. For best manufactured Tobacco, Wm. Crumpton, Lynchburg, exhibited by Ludlam & Watson, Certificate of Merit.

4th Class.

620. For the best and greatest variety of coarse, strong and cheap shoes, H. W. Quarles, Richmond, Certificate of Merit.
 621. For best and cheapest wool hats, R. Moore, Richmond, Certificate of Merit.

BRANCH X.

PREMIUMS BY INDIVIDUAL DONORS.

DULANY PREMIUM.

- For best South Down Buck, R. W. N. Noland, \$30 00

SMITH PREMIUMS.

- For best 1 year old colt by his horse Kossuth, Dr. Wm. P. Braxton, 10 00
 For best 2 year old colt, Alex. Kerr, 10 00

RIVES PREMIUM.

- For best foal, get of his imported horse Emperor, Richard Sampson, 20 00

Discretionary Premiums.

FAT CATTLE.

408. Owned by D. McGavock, 10 00
 409. Owned by Wm. B. & Jas. Byars, 10 00
 414. Owned by Major James Walker, 10 00
 431. Owned by Francis Bell, 10 00
 432. Owned by Francis Bell, 10 00
 491. Owned by Dr. John N. Powell, bull calf 10 months old, Grade and Khasi, 10 00
 Owned by John R. Woods, 3 calves, Khasi and Durham breed, 10 00
 Owned by Mr. Bradford of Culpeper, 1 Silesian Buck, 10 00
 Owned by Dr. Wm. L. Wight, 3 Silesian Ewes, 10 00

Miscellaneous Articles.

- For one wheat Gleaner, H. M. Smith, 5 00
 For 3 fine Carriages, Alfred King, 20 00
 For specimens of Marble Work and Virginia Minerals, John W. Davies, 20 00
 For Chemical and Philosophical Apparatus, Prof. B. H. Benton, 25 00
 For samples of Richmond made Glass Ware, Jacob S. Atlee, 10 00
 For Specimen of Corn Brooms, Wm. P. Thomas, 2 00
 For Wheat Reaper, Morrison & Moore, 10 00
 For crop of Clover Hay, J. Marshall McCue, \$10 00
 For crop of Timothy Hay, J. Marshall McCue, 10 00
 For Clover Seed, J. Marshall McCue, 5 00
 For Timothy Seed, J. Marshall McCue, 5 00

Certificates of Merit.

- For 1 Gelding, general utility, Woods Garth. For 1 " " " E. Thurman.
 For 1 year old Revenue colt, James T. Dickerson, Louisa.

- For 2 fleeces Spanish Wool, S. S. Bradford: J. Caldwell, for his Wheat Reaper and Mower.
 For Spiral Cylinder Threshing Machine, R. Sinclair.

For Thresher, Separator and Grain Cleaner, Francis Nelson.

For Spring adjusting to Seed Drill, Edward Hunt.

For wagon for farm use, D. B. Corrie.

For Straw and Hay Cutter, S. M. Yeamans.

For Double-Acting Lift and Force Pump, Joseph Farrar.

For Forcing Pump, Wm. G. Clarke.

For specimens of Slate from Buckingham, Owen Jones.

For specimens of Porter, Ale, &c., of Richmond manufacture, Certificate of Merit to M. McCormick.

The following articles of Household manufactures were recommended to the attention of the Judges on Discretionary Premiums, but were not exhibited to them, being endorsed not found.

A worked Tidy, exhibited by Mrs. Green Peyton of Albemarle.

A specimen of Variegated Fringe, Mrs. J. J. Fry, Richmond.

A white Quilt, Mrs. George Gibson, Richmond.

Two specimens of Soap made from bones collected from the fields, Mrs. M. C. McCue, Augusta.

A beautiful specimen of patch work in a Silk Quilt, Miss Mary Ella Dobyns, of Essex.

A pair of Socks made of the hair of a lap-dog and spun and knit by herself, Miss M. Angus, Richmond.

A Beed Pincushion, Mrs. J. H. Gilmer, Richmond.

A Morning Dress, Mrs. C. B. Thomas, Richmond.

3 beautiful Towels, Mrs. H. Smith, Russell.

A pair of children's socks, knit by exhibitor, aged 4 years, Nannie Storrs, Henrico.

3 Quilts of patch work, Miss Mary Hopkins.

Two new inventions in Agricultural Machinery were on exhibition and commended to the notice of the Judges on Discretionary Premiums, viz:

Dr. John R. Garnett's Cultivator Wheat Drill, and Mauck & McGahey's Corn Harvester for cutting down corn stalks.

DISCUSSION, ON WHEAT AND ITS CULTURE, by a section of the State Agricultural Society during the State Fair, at Goddin's Hall. EDMUND RUFFIN, Esq., 1st. Vice President, presiding.

The object of the meeting having been explained by the presiding officer, Col. Randolph commenced by remarking: That many systems of rotation had been tried in Albemarle; but that none of them succeeded well that required the frequent repetition of clover during the rotation; as the land seemed to become "clover sick," and a failure of that crop was the consequence. That in England, as he learned from the book entitled "British Husbandry," once in eight years was as often as a good stand of

clover could certainly be counted upon. That his experience was, that after a long rest from clover a good stand was much surer than when that crop was repeated at short intervals. He considered a clover fallow a very costly and laborious preparation for wheat, however certain it might be. Three-fourths of an acre per day being as much as a plough team could average.

He had generally succeeded well by sowing timothy in the fall, on guanoed land. And if the clover sowed on wheat should fail, he had found it succeed well by sowing, the next spring, upon the wheat-stubble and harrowing it in. In seeding wheat upon corn land, he decidedly preferred shallow cultivation—was in the habit of putting it in with a shovel-plough. Thought ploughing the land up with a two horse plough, previous to sowing wheat, the worst possible preparation for that crop on corn land—that mode of preparation rendering his land too "puffy and light." He had never used the drill, but felt favourably inclined to it; could, however, recommend Seymour's broadcast machine. It was an admirable instrument for sowing grass seeds and plaster. It being the opinion of some judicious farmers that half a bushel of plaster, sowed with this machine, was equal to one bushel sowed by hand. Col. R. had succeeded well with wheat on corn land by simply harrowing it in, without other preparation, and he had known others succeed well by the same method.

Maj. J. M. McCue, of Augusta, concurred with Col. R. in the opinion that corn land should not be "flushed" up with a large plough preparatory to seeding with wheat. He was in the habit of drilling wheat upon his corn land with no other previous preparation than cutting up the corn. The corn-stubble interfered but little with the operation of the drill; occasionally the grass and weeds were so thick as to interrupt its successful operation, but this difficulty was readily overcome by the hand who followed the drill carrying a "hooked" stick, by means of which weeds and other matter, as they accumulated before the drill, could be readily removed. He uses Pennock's drill. In his county corn is cultivated with a level surface; the double shovel being the principal implement used. He recommends rolling the wheat in the spring, as it presses down the corn-stubble out of the way of harvesting, and improves the wheat by compressing the land and restoring such plants as are partially thrown out by the winter. He sows one half of his clover-seed in the fall and the remainder in the spring, the time of the fall sowing being between the 15th September and 15th October. He sows clover-seed at the rate of one bushel to eight acres.

Hill Carter, Esq., of Charles City county. Formerly cultivated his lands on the four field system, but is now using the five field rotation. The latter is the most ameliorating of the two;

is the best for corn but not so good for wheat—is a fouler system than the other, and he feels inclined to return to the former. His preparation for wheat is deep and thorough ploughing with four-horse ploughs, the horses hitched two abreast, and two hands to each plough; the driver, in addition to his other duties, removing all obstructions out of the way of the plough. If the season is dry, he rolls with a heavy iron roller and harrows effectually, putting in the wheat either with the drill or broadcast—prefers drilling. On corn land he uses pretty much the same method of preparation—breaking up the land with either three or four-horse ploughs. His land requires bedding, and deep ploughing with a large plough is essential to the proper construction of the beds. His land is stiff, and he ploughs from seven to nine inches deep. Finds five ploughs and twenty horses cheaper and better than seven ploughs and twenty-one horses.

His experience is, that wheat on clover-fallow is better if the land had been grazed previous to ploughing. He had averaged thirty bushels per acre on his fallow land, and his friend, Mr. Selden, had made much larger crops; in one case, forty bushels per acre. Had derived no benefit from the use of guano. In reply to some remarks in regard to the expensiveness of his method of cultivation, Mr. C. stated that he knew a farmer, R. M. Taylor, of Breun, Henrico county, who, upon a plantation of some two hundred acres, cultivated upon this apparently costly system of four-horse plough teams, together with much manual labour, had, until the recent great advance in the price of land and negroes, realized a profit of fifteen per et.; and since the rise, had made ten per et. And another gentleman, who had been unsuccessful in the cultivation of a forest farm upon the cheap system of two-horse ploughs and shallow cultivation, adopted the other plan of four-horse ploughs and deep cultivation, and has found it to succeed admirably.

This gentleman had found it profitable to cart marl some three or four miles.

Mr. J. Selden, of Charles City county. Has for years averaged some thirty bushels wheat on fallow and corn land; pursues the same general system as Mr. Carter. In reference to the use of guano, he one spring, on the 15th of April, spread one ton of guano on the poorest spots of a field of wheat; its beneficial effects were evident in four or five days after the sowing, and these spots proved to be the best wheat in the field. The guano was applied at the rate of 114/lbs. to the acre. Next year used it at the rate of 150/lbs. to the acre, applied at seeding time; the product was about twelve bushels per acre more than the adjoining unguanoed land.

John Marshall, Esq., of Charlotte. Until within the last four or five years, did not attempt to raise wheat except upon tobacco lots that had been highly manured. In reference

to the preparation of the land and sowing—the best crop he ever made was on land well ploughed with two-horse ploughs and subsoiled; part of it was corn land, the remainder tobacco land. He knew a man once to sow his wheat on the top of the land and then plough it in with a four-horse plough. The wheat came up well and made a good crop.

Willoughby Newton, Esq., Westmoreland. Had, by the use of guano, averaged twenty bushels to one sown, on land that at the time could be purchased for four dollars per acre. The preparation of the land for seeding consisted in ploughing with a two-horse plough, and then putting the wheat in with a cultivator, and afterwards harrowing. Used about 200/lbs. guano to the acre. Has since averaged as high as seventeen bushels to the acre on same land, but has not succeeded in equalling the first crop of twenty bushels, although the land is evidently greatly improved, producing good crops of grass and corn. Thinks this may be explained by the greater number of insects that prey upon the crop and the increased foulness of the land, owing to its greater fertility. Last year his wheat crop was a very indifferent one, averaging about six bushels to one sown; owing in a great degree, he thought, to the extremely dry season.

He thought the cheaper system of cultivation pursued upon the poor lands of the Northern Neck paid a higher per centum of profit than the more costly and thorough course pursued upon the rich lands of the lower James river. As in the Northern Neck, the entire fee simple value of the land was often realized in a single year from the crops sold.

To show the great enhancement in the value of lands in his section of the State, by the use of concentrated manures and a better system of farming, Mr. N. stated that the lands of Westmoreland were, by the last assessment, of 1850, valued at \$800,000, but by the assessment of the present year, the lands of that county were valued at \$1,600,000. He would recommend a cheap system in the cultivation of the soil and a liberal expenditure in fertilizers.

Perhaps there was no part of the world in which guano had produced such wonderful results as upon the thin lands in the Northern Neck. Where he had made the twenty bushels of wheat to the acre, referred to, before, others, by a more liberal use of guano, had grown twenty-eight, thirty, and even thirty-six bushels to the acre. This striking effect of guano had been ascribed by some to the dampness of the climate, it being a narrow strip of country lying between two large rivers. Guano, however, had a greater effect on the forest than on the river lands. Since the use of guano rust had been much less frequent than formerly. The soil so much benefitted by the use of guano, has in it much sand; it might, perhaps, be described as a white sandy loam; a good ploughing turning up clay enough to give it sufficient cohesion.

On these lands guano is as permanent in its effects as any other manure; on the river lands it acts neither so promptly nor are its effects so durable. He considered 200*lbs.* better for wheat than any amount of stable manure. Had used bone-dust to some extent, but did not consider it at all equal to guano.

Mr. Cunningham, of Culpepper. Considered it cheaper to use four than three-horse ploughs; the former more effectually exterminated running briars and sassafras. Puts in his wheat with a double shovel plough. Has been in the habit of seeding one and a half bushels to the acre; but has lately been sowing two bushels. Averages about twenty bushels to the acre. Finds but little difference between wheat on corn land and clover fallow. Uses guano to a considerable extent.

Mr. Garnett, of Westmoreland. Thinks he has derived great benefit from using plaster in much larger quantities than has been customary. Upon one occasion tried the following experiment upon five acres of land: Upon the first acre, one bushel of plaster was sown; upon the second, two bushels; and increasing at that rate until the fifth acre received five bushels. The beneficial effects were in proportion to the quantity of plaster used. Upon a single acre he once used ten bushels. The yield was magnificent. He highly approves of the use of plaster in connection with that of guano, and thinks he has derived much advantage from using it in that way. The land he has been cultivating was very poor and unproductive when he took possession of it. He purchased it for \$4 per acre. Under the use of guano and plaster, it has been so much improved that at the recent assessment of lands it was valued at \$25 per acre. He finds harrowing in the spring beneficial to his wheat. Thinks it essential to use clover in conjunction with guano, if permanent improvement is aimed at. Is of opinion that the wonderful effects of guano in the Northern Neck cannot be accounted for on the hypothesis of the moisture of the climate, because the lands upon the rivers are less benefited than those in the interior.

SECOND NIGHT.

SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

Mr. Willis, of Orange county. Rust has not been so common for four or five years—this seems to be general and not confined to any particular district. Neither has the joint-worm been so destructive the two last years, owing, probably, to the earlier seeding of the wheat; but thinks there is no reason for supposing it has disappeared from the country. Has never been benefitted by the use of guano. In one instance, thinks a small spot guanoed at the rate of 300*lbs.* to the acre was permanently injured. After the regular course of crops, and being sown in grass, it was so much worse than the adjoining land as to attract the attention of strangers. His land is the red land of the Piedmont region; observed no difference in the

subsoil—the same as is common in the red land district. Is satisfied that three-fourths of the money he has expended for guano has been thrown away. Sees no improvement on wheat from its use, although other persons on similar lands think they are benefitted. Used 8½ tons on 203 bushels seed wheat, product 1100 bushels. Always ploughs in his wheat. On corn land, thinks the soil ought to be disturbed as little as possible. He, however, harrows his previous to sowing wheat, as he cultivates corn with a mouldboard plough, throwing the earth to the corn, and the consequence is, the surface is too uneven to receive the seed without harrowing. Has not been successful in making wheat on corn land when he ploughed it up with a large plough. He considers it best to harrow first and then put in the wheat with a small plough or double shovel.

Mr. F. Nelson, of New Kent county. Thinks Col. Randolph's method of seeding may do on his land; but upon stiff low ground, decidedly prefers deep ploughing and thorough preparation. He never cuts wheat when it is wet even with dew; and prefers that it should be *entirely* ripe before cutting.

Dr. Morton, of Cumberland. Has drilled wheat for several years; thinks it the best method of seeding, as each grain is deposited at the same depth, and it also saves seed, he now, with the drill, using but one bushel and a peck, when formerly he broadcasted two bushels to the acre. Is of opinion that having the land well drained, so as to prevent water from stagnating about the crop, will prevent rust in wheat and "firing" in tobacco. At least since he has adopted this practice, he has been less injured from these diseases.

Mr. Cunningham, of Culpepper. Never derived any advantage from drilling wheat over sowing it broadcast; but experienced this disadvantage, that grass seeds sowed in the spring on drilled wheat would also be drilled, the seed running into the drills.

Mr. Crenshaw, of Richmond. In the year 1851, over an entire field of 32 acres, drilled each alternate bed and sowed the remainder broadcast. The drilled came up the best, the season being dry, and although he made no accurate measurement, yet he estimated the drilled wheat to be 33½ per cent. the best. The broadcast wheat was harrowed in. The drilled matured the earliest; has since used the drill successfully.

Hill Carter, Esq., of Charles City county. Prefers drilling; but upon his lands it saves no seed; requires as much as broadcast sowing. In this opinion Mr. Selden concurs; but thinks the drilled less liable to be winter killed.

Mr. — Paleske, of Henrico. Thinks wheat ought to be drilled from the North-east to the South-west, as that is the prevalent direction of the winds in the summer.

Mr. C. Lee, of Powhatan county. Remarkd on the vagueness and indefiniteness of agricul-

tural terms, and told an amusing story in illustration of his idea.

Col. Randolph, of Albemarle, stated some interesting facts establishing the proposition that wheat might safely be cut before it was entirely ripe, while in the "dough state." He had found the same measure of wheat, much shrivelled from being cut too green, to weigh heavier than the same measure of plump wheat. He had noticed a marked difference in the ripening of wheat, sometimes the straw maturing first, and again the grain ripening earliest. That in harvesting we ought to be governed by the condition of the grain, it being the most valuable and most reliable test. He never stops cutting wheat because it is wet. One harvest he cut all the week in a drenching rain, and the wheat sustained no injury thereby. Wheat is more liable to be injured by rain after it has once been thoroughly dry. He has been much benefitted by guano on lands similar to those of Mr. Willis of Orange.

Dr. Garnett, of Henrico. Related the following experiment on cutting wheat: That cut in the milk state, some ten days before entire ripeness, was badly shrivelled and light, whilst between that cut in the dough state and that fully ripe there was but little difference, that cut in dough state shrinking but little.

Edmund Ruffin, Esq., Hanover. In the year 1821, or 1822, commenced cutting wheat in the dough state, and has pursued that course ever since; and has been the gainer thereby. He, one year, by this early harvesting, secured his entire crop in good condition, when the crops of other persons, who postponed cutting until the wheat was fully ripe, had their crops much injured. He means by the "dough state," that condition of the wheat when it can be mashed between the finger and thumb without producing milk. He would prefer cutting wheat fully ripe if the entire crop could be secured in that condition, but as that cannot be done, he considers it much better to commence in the "dough state" than to wait until all is ripe. Has cut wheat in the "pap state" with scarcely an appreciable loss. Would recommend letting the wheat intended for seed get entirely ripe before cutting; although he has never hesitated to sow wheat cut in the "dough state," and don't know that he has ever sustained any loss thereby. He, one year, cut his seed wheat quite early, in order to get clear of some spelt that was mixed with it. This seed grew as well as any; and the spelt vegetated although cut in the "milk state." Has suffered but little from smut. When wheat is fully ripe it is injured by every wetting it gets, although it may not sprout, by converting its starch into gluten. Does not think wheat likely to "run out." He commenced sowing the early purple straw in 1821, and has continued it ever since with entire success. One year he obtained his seed from a neighbor, his own crop being too much injured by rust to sow. But this wheat had originally been obtained from him.

From the Papers of the Nottoway Farmer.
COMPARATIVE VALUE OF GUANO AND
EXTRA HOMEMADE MANURES.

Mr. President:—I reported a set of experiments last year made on corn, one of the objects of which was to ascertain the comparative cost of resuscitating poor land by applications of vegetable matter, and turning under peas. I intended this year to report accurately the results of the same on the present crop of wheat, but owing to the depredations of both hessian fly and chinchbug in that part of my field, the experiment has proved well nigh a failure. But as the question for discussion to-day is nearly allied to the experiment made, I beg leave instead of a report thereon, to offer up a few thoughts on the subject before us, as my annual contribution.

The subject "cannot the money annually expended by us for guano, be more profitably used in collecting material for, and increasing the production of domestic manures?" does not, I suppose, refer to farm pen and stable manure as usually made, but to collecting and hauling, composting or spreading vegetable matter, rich earth, &c., &c.

Before entering into the investigation of the subject I will make a statement or two which I hope will be useful in arriving at a correct decision. The plan of making domestic manure partakes of the principle of making permanent investments of capital, with a view of permanent and progressive improvements on the farm; rather than immediate profit, while the use of guano is more on the principle of lending money with the expectation of receiving back, at the expiration of a given time, the principal and whatever interest may accrue, not however leaving out of view the expectation of direct permanent improvement to the land, and the increase of offal from crops to be used for food for cattle and for farm-pen manure. A failure to make a crop on either plan may occur from unfavorable seasons, &c., but the loss on the system of domestic manure will not be so great as the improvement is greater and more certain in proportion to amount risked, than by the use of guano.

I will now proceed to state as near as I can the probable expense and profit on the first system for a term of five years, on the five field rotation which is as follows—for one year,

To hire of three hands,	\$175 00
To finding, do,	50 00
To clothing—hats, shoes, &c., for 'do,	20 00
To use of cart, two oxen, finding do,	
Wear and Tear,	70 00

Amounting to	\$315 00
--------------	----------

Supposing this force will manure one acre per week, and counting fifty weeks or three hundred working days to the year the cost of manuring will be \$6.30 per acre. In my estimate last year which was thought by the club not too high, I made it \$9 per acre where vegetable matter was plenty and as convenient as

possible. The last year's estimate was by hire by the day, this, by the year. At this rate the force will manure fifty acres per year; and supposing the process to continue five years, the account will stand as follows,

To improving 250 acres of land at \$630,	\$1575 00
To interest on \$315 for five years,	94 50

Amounting to	\$1669 50
--------------	-----------

By improved condition of 250 acres of land at the expiration, of 5 years, say \$2 per acre,	\$500 00
---	----------

By increased production of corn on the several fields as they come into cultivation, say 1 bbl. to the acre, corn at \$3 per bbl.	\$750 00
---	----------

By increased production of wheat on the several fields as they come into wheat, supposing two 50 acre fields in wheat each year, say 1 bus. per acre,* 500 bus. at	\$125 per bus.	\$625 00
--	----------------	----------

Amounting to	\$1875 00
--------------	-----------

By balance in favor of the system of	\$205 50
--------------------------------------	----------

I will not enter into a detailed calculation on the guano system as I find my communication will be too long, but will simply say, there will be the same rotation of crops. By applying 100 lbs. of guano to the acre in the drill on 50 acres of land each year for corn and 200 lbs. to the acre for wheat on 100 acres, there will be used annually 12½ tons of guano which at \$55 per ton comes to \$687 50. Now supposing there will be only a clear gain of one half barrel of corn per acre, and one half bushel of wheat per acre in the rotation after paying for the guano and interest thereon, and only 50 cts. per acre for improved condition of the land at the expiration of five years, the account will stand thus—

By cash for improvement in 250 acres of land at 50 cts. per acre,	\$125 00
---	----------

By cash for 125 bbls. corn at \$3 per bbl.	\$375 00
--	----------

By ditto. for 250 bus. wheat at \$1 25 per bushel,	\$312 50
--	----------

Amounting to	\$812 50
--------------	----------

From which deduct profit on 1st system,	\$205 50
---	----------

Difference in favor of guano system,	\$607 00
--------------------------------------	----------

I am not an advocate for using 200 lb of gua-

* By mistake this was put 2 bushels per acre, but the amount \$625 00 was carried out as above. This gave rise to a review by Mr. Bland.

no per acre for corn, but think it probable that 100 lbs. in the drill to start the corn would pay well, and also bring into cultivation land which would not be cultivated without guano, or some other active concentrated manure. It may be said that there is no profit by the use of guano. In reply I have to say that I have some years sustained loss by the use of guano, both on corn and wheat, while I have in other years made after paying for guano \$7,11 on corn, and about \$5 on wheat, to the acre, over and above the amount made on similar land cultivated without guano, which is about 120 per cent. nett interest, per annum.

If tobacco be substituted for corn and 200 or 250 lbs. guano to the acre be used, the result will probably be much more favorable, as common old field thus dressed, will bring better tobacco than we generally make on our new and second years' ground, and will also bring a good crop of wheat without a second dressing of guano. In relation to the two acres reported on last year, one with a pretty heavy dressing of pine beards, the other having been in oats and peas, I will state that the wheat made this year after the pea fallow is, I think, rather better than that after the pine beards, and judging from the looks of the ground and the vegetation now growing on the two acres I think the pea fallow acre has the advantage also as to improvement of soil. Perhaps extra labor is as much needed, and may on the most of our farms be as judiciously expended in clearing hedgerows, skirts of pines, &c., so as to bring into one unbroken field that which is now cut into nooks and corners. I was very much pleased with an improvement of this sort made by our friend Mr. T. F. Epes, on one of his fields, over which I had the pleasure of riding with him some short time since. I think it probable, that he would not have gone so extensively into that improvement, had it not been for guano. I think we may look with more hope to the recuperative tendency of land to recover itself under a judicious system than to the slow process of hauling vegetable matter on it. This system of robbing Peter to pay Paul is not on the whole a gaining one; as it is evident there is not only damage done to the land by hauling off vegetable matter, but the undergrowth is also injured. To conclude: were I to use extra labor I would bestow it in connection with the use of guano in clearing hedgerow skirts of pines, &c., where the timber will never be useful for rails—let it remain at least one year on the ground, fallow such land for corn or wheat as circumstances and quality of land may justify, at times when he land on the balance of the farm may be too, wet to plough, and by this means bring into cultivation land that is now entirely useless and thereby improve both the appearance and the productiveness of the whole.

Respectfully, submitted,

WM. IRBY.

MR. PRESIDENT—Having no satisfactory experiment in progress for the current year, and believing the subject of manuring, under discussion at our July meeting, one of great and commanding importance, and the results arrived at in the essay submitted by my friend, Mr. William Irby, (which seemed to be generally considered as conclusive) to be erroneous, and likely to mislead in an important matter, I have concluded, in discharge of the duty imposed on me by our constitution, to bring that subject to your attention again. The subject of discussion was, in substance, the comparative benefits to be derived from the use of home-made manure and guano, or can any other mode of manuring be adopted with profit, in the place of guano. For the purpose of this inquiry I will first take the estimates of Mr. Irby, and then the actual results of my own operations for the last four years.

Mr. Irby estimates the cost of improving 25 acres of land with home-made manure, cost of labor, interest, &c., at	\$1,669 50
Or by improved value of 250 acres land at \$2 per acre,	\$500 00
By increased product of corn on 250 acres, 1 bbl. per acre, \$3,	750 00
By increased product of wheat on 500 acres 2 bu. per acre, 1,000 bushels, at \$1 25,	1,250 00
	<u>2,500 00</u>

An excess or profit of \$830 50 for home-made manure over expenditures estimated at \$205 50, as appears by Mr. Irby's account. This difference arises from what I conceive to be an error in Mr. Irby's account of credits to home-made manures; he makes the credit just one-half of what, according to my understanding of his estimates, it ought to be, he estimates the profits resulting from the use of \$3,427 50 worth of guano to be \$812 50, and states that the profit from guano exceeds the profits of home-made manures \$606, whereas the excess ought to have been the other way by the sum of \$18.

But, it is to be remarked, that in the estimate, in the use of home-made manures, the sum of \$1,669 50 in labor was used in one case, and \$3,427 50 worth of guano was used in the other, the profit for guano to be equal to the profit for home-made manure, according to the estimate, ought to be at least \$1,700, to be in proportion to the amount risked, and much greater if in proportion to the risk incurred.

But again taking Mr. Irby's estimate of cost of improvement and profits as the basis of what I think a fair and just comparison of profits, let us see what will be the result:

250 acres land improved at a cost of	\$1,669 50
Or by 250 barrels of corn at \$3 per barrel,	\$750 00

By 700 bushels of wheat at \$1 25 per bushel,	875 00
By 250 acres land increased value \$2 per acre,	500 00
	<u>2,125 00</u>

Profit on home-made manure,	\$455 50
\$1,669 50 at 500 pounds guano per acre, the guano at \$55 per ton, will manure 121½ acres.	
121½ acres at ½ barrel corn per acre,	
60½ barrels at \$3,	\$182 25
243 acres at ½ bushel wheat per acre, is 121½ bushels at \$1 25,	151 87
121½ acres improved value at 50 cents per acre,	60 75
	<u>\$394 87</u>
Profit for \$1,669 50 of guano,	
Profit from \$1,669 50 of home manure,	455 50

Excess of profit of home-made manure over guano, \$60 63

I made at my Springfield farm in 1852, 1,083 bushels of wheat from 143 sowed, a gain of 7½ for one, and in 1853, 1,051½ from 120 sowed, a gain of nearly 9 for one; both these crops were without guano. In 1854, with 3½ tons guano I made 909 bushels from 159 sowed, a gain of not quite 6 for one; in 1855, using 6 tons of guano, I made 1,122 bushels from 159 sowed, a gain of 7 for one, in 1856 using 68 tons guano, not more than 800 bushels from 200 sowed—an estimated gain of 4 for one, or an average gain, for the three years, of about 6 for one.

Supposing that the guano is entitled to credit for half the product, the account will stand thus:

Cost of improving 121½ acres with guano,	\$1,669 50
Or by increased product of corn on 121½ acres of land, say 1 bbl. per acre at \$3,	\$364 50
By increased product of wheat on 243 acres 3 bu. at \$1 25,	911 25
By increase in value of land, 50 cts. per acre,	60 75
	<u>1,336 50</u>

Loss from guano, \$333 00

Now if you carry the comparison through another term of 5 years, the difference will be much greater in favor of home-made manures. For land improved \$2 per acre in productive power is in good condition for a rotation; whereas on land improved only to the amount of 50 cents per acre, the difference would not be seen in either the land or the crop.

After all, I am not disposed to say we ought not to use guano, but under all the circumstances, the risk of loss from bad seasons, the risk of adulteration, and the high costs of the article, we ought to be cautious in its use and still

hold to the sheet anchor of the farmer's home-made manures.

Respectfully submitted,
WM. R. BLAND.

MR. PRESIDENT,—I beg leave to review a review by my friend, Mr. Bland, on my essay read before the club at our July meeting. Perhaps it is unnecessary to say, I do this, not in the spirit of controversy, for I am persuaded that both of us are anxious to detect error and elicit truth. It should be distinctly borne in mind while comparing the relative merits of the guano and the domestic manure systems, that both the stable and farm pen manure as generally made, by the use of straw, shucks, &c., are common to both systems. Not only that, but also the vegetable matter collected in wet spells and at odd times by the hands and teams, for which a full crop has been pitched, is alike common to both systems. The comparison should be instituted between the cost of extra hands and teams hired or set apart for the especial purpose of raising extra domestic manure, and the cost and risk of a floating capital for guano, and between their relative profits. I make this remark because it was not so clearly brought to view in my essay as it should have been, nor does it appear to have had that prominence in Mr. Bland's review which it is entitled to.

I will first tender to Mr. Bland my thanks for having brought to view a very palpable error in my essay, which escaped my notice. This occurs in my estimate of the domestic system, in which I gave credit for \$625, for the increased production of wheat on the several fields as they come into wheat. By an obvious mistake I put the increased production at two, instead of one bushel per acre, as written in my original manuscript, but the amount carried out was \$625. After considerable thought and consultation I concluded the increased production from the domestic manure system, should be double the nett increased production from the use of guano. But supposing it to be four times as great, it has only \$18 the advantage in a rotation of five years, as shown by Mr. Bland's statement.

The next item to be noticed in Mr. Bland's Review, is as follows: "But it is to be remarked that in the estimate in the use of home made manure the sum of \$1669 50 in labor was used, in the one case, and \$3437 50 worth of guano was used in the other, the profits for guano to be equal to the profit for home-made manure according to the estimate, ought to be at least \$1700, to be in proportion to the amount risked, and much greater if in proportion to the risk incurred."

In reply to this, I need only say the \$1669 50 is a permanent investment, while the \$687 50 per annum is only a floating capital used when the guano is purchased, and replaced with interest, when the crop is sold. Now suppose on both systems the money had to be borrowed. At the end of the five years the domestic system

would owe \$1669 50 and the guano system would owe nothing, as the principal and interest are annually paid from the proceeds of the crop to which it has been applied. This shows one of the most prominent excellencies of the guano system; for the owner of land so exhausted that it will not pay for cultivation, can, with guano, bring it into cultivation with a profit in the operation, and leave it in an improved condition.

The next in order is as follows: "But again, taking Mr. Irby's estimate of cost of improvement and profits as the basis of what I think a fair and just comparison of profits, let us see what will be the result.

250 acres of land improved at a cost of \$1669 50	
Cr. By 250 barrels of corn at \$3 per bbl.	\$750 00
By 700 bushels wheat at \$1 25 per bushel,	875 00
By 250 acres of land, increased value at \$2,	500 00
	2125 00

Profit on home manure system,	\$455 50
-------------------------------	----------

\$1669 50 at \$500 lbs guano per acre, the guano at \$55 per ton, will manure 121½ acres.

121½ acres at ½ bbl. corn per acre, 60½ bbls. at \$3,	182 25
243 acres at ½ bus. which per acre is 121½ bus. at \$1 25	151 87
121½ acres land improved value, at 50 cts. per acre,	60 75

Profit for \$1669 50 of guano,	394 87
--------------------------------	--------

Excess of profit of home manure over guano,	\$60 63
---	---------

In relation to the above, I have only to say that Mr. Bland, I suppose by mistake, gives a credit in his home manure system for increased production of 700 bushels wheat at \$125, amounting to,

\$875 00
In my estimate it is 500 bus. at \$1 25 per bushel,
625 00

Difference,	\$250 00
-------------	----------

Showing a bal. in favor of guano system of	\$189 37
--	----------

After this is a statement of crops of wheat made on Springfield farm in 1852 and '53, without guano at an average of 8½ bushels for one sowed. Also of crops made in 1854, 5 and 6, with the use of guano—at an average of 5½ bus. for one sowed, showing a loss by the use of guano—and showing also that the land produced less with guano than it did without it. This would militate very much against the guano system without an explanation. But when it is remembered that the years 1852 and 3 were remarkably good wheat years, and that the years 1855 and 6, owing to unfavorable seasons, fly and chinchbug, were remarkably bad ones,—it

shows only an accidental yield not at all affecting the guano system.

The review then proceeds thus: "Now if you carry the comparison through another term of five years, the difference will be much greater in favor of the home manure system, for land improved \$2 per acre in productive power, is in a good condition for a rotation, whereas in land improved only to the amount of 50 cents per acre, the difference would not be seen either in the land or crop." In reply to this I candidly say that I was so much afraid of overshooting, that I greatly undershot the mark, as I believe, (and a large majority of the club who have used guano coincided in the belief,) that two applications of 200 lbs. to the acre to two which crops in a rotation on the fire field system, will benefit the land greatly more than I stated. From my own experience and observation I deem it inexpedient to use guano on land which, unaided, will in ordinary years produce more than seven bushels of wheat to the acre. Nor do I believe that with guano alone, poor land can be made rich in a short term of years, but its great excellence, when used on an extended rotation is, that it enables owners of poor land to overcome without loss, the first and most difficult step in reseedating such land. Unfortunately for us we have a considerable portion of such land. In my estimate of home made manure, I calculated on three hundred working days in the year. This is an overestimate after deducting for sickness, Sabbaths, holidays, rainy days, &c. I also took it for granted that vegetable matter, &c., were plenty and convenient to every field designed to be improved, but this is oftener the reverse. This is a very interesting and important subject and I would be pleased to see a liberal premium offered by the State and Union agricultural societies for the best experiment on it, and also to have a set of experiments instituted on the model farm of the Union society for the purpose of deciding it.

Respectfully submitted,
WM. IRBY.

STEWED FRESH BEEF AND RICE.—Put an ounce of fat in a pot; cut half a pound of meat in thin slices; add a teaspoonful of salt, half one of sugar, an onion sliced; put on the fire to stew for fifteen minutes, stirring occasionally; then add two ounces of rice, and a pint of water; stew gently till done, and serve. Fresh pork, veal or mutton, may be done the same way, and a half pound of potatoes used instead of rice.

SCIENCE.—For all practical purposes true science is a *thorough knowledge of a man's own business*. And a farmer who knows how to make the most profit with the least amount of labor and capital, who understands how to make the most of his land without impoverishing it, but rather continually improving it, is truly scientific.—*Rural American*.



THE SOUTHERN PLANTER.

RICHMOND, DECEMBER, 1856.

TERMS.

ONE DOLLAR and TWENTY-FIVE CENTS per annum or ONE DOLLAR *only* if paid *in advance*. Six copies or FIVE DOLLARS; Thirteen copies for TEN DOLLARS—to be paid invariably *in advance*.

No subscription received for a less time than one year.

Subscriptions may begin with any Number, but it is *desirable* that they should be made to the end of a volume.

Subscribers who do not give express notice to the contrary on or before the expiration of their yearly Subscription, will be considered as wishing to continue the same; and the paper will be sent accordingly.

No paper will be discontinued until all arrearages are paid, except at our option.

Subscribers are requested to remit the amount of their Subscription as soon as the same shall become due.

If Subscribers neglect or refuse to take their papers from the Office or place to which they are sent, they will be held responsible until they settle their account and give notice to discontinue.

If Subscribers remove, change their offices, or permit their paper to be sent to an office that has been discontinued, without directing a change of their paper, and the paper is sent to the former direction, they will be held responsible.

All Payments to the Southern Planter will be acknowledged in the first paper issued after the same shall have been received.

All money remitted to us will be considered at our risk *only* when the letter containing the same shall have been registered.

It is indispensably necessary that subscribers remitting their Subscription, should name the Office to which their papers are sent; and those ordering a change should say *from* what to what post office they wish the alteration made. A strict observance of this rule will save much time to us and lose none to them besides insuring attention to their wishes.

Postmasters are requested to notify us in *writing* as the law requires, when papers are not taken from their Offices by Subscribers.

RUFFIN & AUGUST, Proprietors.

OFFICE: No. 153, Corner Main and Twelfth Streets.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

Will be inserted at the following rates; For each square of ten lines, first insertion, One Dollar; each continuance Seventy-five Cents.

Advertisements out of the City must be accompanied with the money, to insure their insertion,

POSTAGE on the Southern Planter, (when paid in advance,) to any part of the United States one cent and a half per quarter, or six cents per annum.

FOURTH ANNUAL EXHIBITION OF THE VIRGINIA STATE AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY.

All the world knows that the above fair was held on the 28th day of last month and the three following days. All the world knows also that it succeeded as well as any that preceded it. To us who have known something of all of them it was evidently, in all essentials, the best fair that has yet been held, and gives, in its main features, a guarantee of future success. Its "type," to use the breeders term, has become "fixed."

We observe in most of our Agricultural exchanges, a somewhat detailed notice of the articles and implements exhibited at the fairs which they respectively describe. We cannot go into such minutiae. If interesting, and altogether proper, and of good personal policy, we have never had time to make notes of such things. It has been our practice, as a member of the executive committee to report ourself to the Chief Marshall each day as on duty, and we have found our hands full.

But certain things we could not help seeing, and to see was to commend. For instance, Morison's reaper, and Caldwell's reaper could hardly escape attention or fail to command approval: John Haw's woodpecker saw was not less conspicuous in merit. And as the inventions, of Virginians we were proud of them.

Red Eye was on the ground, and had reason to be proud of himself. He looked Virginian every inch of him. So did the beautiful Revenue—an inferior horse—begging the committee's pardon—to Red Eye, but still a Virginian.

"The fat stock" were all Virginian, every pound of them, and the fattest and finest we ever saw. They out cloyed Cloyd. The Southwest beat herself this time, and the rest of the world was no where. Does Augusta mean to stay beat, and will the South Branch never show her face?

The best sheep, we are sorry to say was not a Virginian. But he was imported from England direct by a Virginian, than whom there is not a more public spirited gentleman in the States. We allude to Mr. Dulany of Loudoun's South down Buck—the finest sheep we dare affirm in America, and probably the second or third best in England.

Neither were the Silesians—a newly introduced race of fine wools, (said, and we think truly, to combine the weight of the merino and the

fineness of the Saxon, and therefore superior to either) the product of Virginia. They were of the importation either directly, or by descent, of Geo. Campbell of Vermont, whom we take to be an honest sheep dealer.

Nor were the hogs which we preferred, the beautiful and genuine Berkshires of our own State. For them also we have to thank our friend Mr. Dulany of Loudoun.

Of the horticultural products, it is proper to say that all were good, almost tempting one to eat them uncooked. If we were to select a single vegetable we should say of Mr. Staples's potatoes,—large as cannon balls, breaking down when cooked like a well thawed clod, yielding three hundred and ninety two bushels per acre from a June planting—as Coleridge's august acquaintance said of the dumplings, "them's the jockies for me."

Of the needlework, &c., we can only say that we think there is a good deal of time wasted by women at large on the needle; that in many cases a needle is either an excuse for idleness or a feminine stimulant, but little better than our tobacco; that therefore we never patronize such articles, and would advise all sensible ladies to buy a sewing machine, and some roses, a garden hoe and a trowel—work at the sewing machine one hour in lieu of ten at the needle, and then derive health and amusement from the flower-garden.

After that at leisure times let them do tapestry work if they will, as an elegant accomplishment, and rival, if they will not neglect health and exercise in the contest, the Baycux tapestry of Matilda. The sewing machine for work, the needle for recreation.

Of the crowd we can only say as we said once before, they looked, not *dressed*, like gentlemen and ladies.

The race track, as usual, was the centre of attraction, and we have reason to complain of it. Originally introduced because it "drew the crowd," it has come to be too much used. It "draws" committee men from their duty, and is we think a chief difficulty in getting them assembled. It distracts from the examination of other animals, and from implements; it gets up excitements; it encourages the passion—not a very elevated one—for fast horses, and converts the fair ground into a hippodrome. This is surely not right, and not necessary to a successful fair. The executive committee were willing

to give three days to this sort of sport, but their rules required that there should be none of it on Tuesday.

So much for the exhibition.

The proceedings of the Farmers' Assembly, except the President's Report, whose length excludes it from our columns, will be found elsewhere. We have no comment to offer on them, further than to say that every resolution is good or suggestive of good, and that the members behaved, as was to have been expected from such a body of gentlemen, with dignity and decorum.

It will be seen that Col. Cocke has signalized his retirement from the Presidency of the Society, by an act of rare generosity and public spirit. It is with pleasure that we record this fulfilment of expectations which, from a knowledge of Col. Cocke's character, we felt authorized to encourage nearly four years ago. Then, in introducing him as the newly elected President of the Society, we said, and now repeat with proof of the fact, "he is a man of wealth, munificence, public spirit, energy and system, entirely devoted to Virginia and her institutions, and thoroughly imbued with the spirit of rural improvement." Differing with this gentleman as we have done, and still do, on a good many questions both inside and outside the organization of the society, we have never failed to accord him the merit of the above characteristics.

Of the importance of his donation of \$20,000 towards the endowment of an Agricultural Professorship, it is impossible to speak at present in adequate terms. If this nucleus of agricultural instruction shall receive its due increase of means, we shall expect the farming of thirty years hence to be as far ahead of the present process as general education now is in advance of what it was when the University of Virginia first dawned upon the State in 1825. Book farming will then be the rule and not the exception, the pride and not the reproach, and all will then admit what too few now know, that it is unwise to esteem a man more ignorant because he is more learned, and less fitted to apply principles to details because he has learned them in the abstract. Principle will then be to practice what pure are to mixed mathematics, and necessary to be learned as the readiest road to the accurate knowledge of agriculture.

In the remarks with which Mr. Harvie of Amelia accompanied his resolutions on a perma-

nent fund for the Virginia State Agricultural Society, on that memorable first of November, 1853, he said that the movement there commenced would not stop there; but that consequences would result which no man could foresee, and whose benefits no man could estimate.

This donation of Col. Cocke's is one of these consequences, which like a grafted bough will bear fruit of its own.

Of the various agricultural addresses, Dr. McGuffey's, Dr. Pendleton's and Mr. Franklin Minor's, each was good of its kind. We regret that Dr. McGuffey's is not to be published. The remarks of so just a thinker on the relation of theory to practice, and the results of their union, could not fail to be instructive. Mr. Minor's and Dr. Pendleton's we hope to be able to publish.

One of the most interesting features of the gathering to us was the discussions at the meetings of the *second section*, as it was called, which took place every night during the exhibition. The subject selected for the first night was "wheat." The interest excited by the subject and the mode of treating it was so great that no other was pursued, and though the sessions were protracted until eleven o'clock each night, there was no sign of weariness among the members.

A sketch of the discussion for two of the nights will be found in another part of this paper; and we regret that the indisposition of the reporter prevented his attendance at the third meeting, when the discussion turned on peas as a preparation for wheat, and, incidentally, as an improver of the land. The sketch is not full: none but a practised reporter and short hand writer could have followed the speakers, who in an easy and conversational way stated their views, for the most part in reply to questions put to them by different persons for the purpose of gaining further or more exact information. Our own evenings were spent entirely at these meetings when we had just people enough present to make it agreeable. We do not remember ever to have gained an equal amount of instruction in the same time. By all means let the section meetings continue.

MR. BRUCE'S DONATION.

At the late Fair of the Petersburg Union Agricultural Society, we understand that Mr. James C. Bruce of Halifax county, the President of that Society, agreed to give it ten thousand dollars

on condition that the City of Petersburg should contribute two thousand dollars per annum in perpetuity. We further learn that this condition will be submitted to the voters of the City of Petersburg, by whom, we suppose, as a matter of course, it will be adopted.

By this liberality, which is the second instance of the kind we have had the pleasure of recording, and only second to the generosity of Col. Cocke, the Union Society will be placed on nearly the same pecuniary footing with the State society. With such friends at command, it will be, we hope, in the power of those two societies to accomplish a great deal of good. Much certainly will be expected of them, and, very probably, much more than either could accomplish with twice the means at their disposal.

FAIRS OF THE UNION, SEABOARD AND RAPPAHANNOCK AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES.

We have been pleased to learn that all of the above societies had very satisfactory exhibitions within the last six weeks.

We shall be glad to publish such accounts of them as their authorities may furnish.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

We earnestly request that you will read our "Terms" at least *once a year*, and *always* before writing us upon any subject connected with your paper. We frequently receive letters containing remittances, and others requesting discontinuances or directing a change to other post-offices when the office to which the paper is sent is not named. Such omissions occasion us a great deal of trouble, and it not unfrequently happens that your wishes cannot be attended to in consequence of your neglect to conform to this *standing request*.

REMEMBER *always* to name your post office when writing about your paper.

GENERAL NOTICE.

In accordance with the notice given in a previous number of this paper, we commenced with the July number to drop from our list, all subscribers who are in arrears for three years or more, and shall continue to do so until the first of January next, at which time we intend

to drop all who are then in arrears for two years and upwards. But in doing so we do not intend to relinquish our right to collect our dues from such delinquents, but shall send out their accounts regularly or place them in the hands of Agents for collection. We do not design to adopt *strictly* the *cash system*, but we desire to approach as near to it as possible, and wish our "Terms," which are printed conspicuously in every paper to be understood by *all* our subscribers. They are as follows:

TERMS.

ONE DOLLAR and TWENTY-FIVE CENTS per annum, or ONE DOLLAR *only*, if paid in *advance*. Six copies for FIVE DOLLARS; Thirteen copies for TEN DOLLARS—to be paid invariably in *advance*; and to them we mean strictly to adhere, with this variation only, subscribers who owe for two years, or \$2 50 and remit, \$5 will be credited for two years of arrearages and three years in advance. We think no one who intends to pay can object to this arrangement.

WANTED

January and September numbers of the Planter. Subscribers who do not preserve their papers for binding, and who have either or both of the above numbers will confer a great favor upon us by forwarding them to this office.

THE SOUTHERN PLANTER BOUND.

In reply to numerous enquiries on the subject, we state that we can furnish the "Southern Planter" bound, at \$1 50 per volume, postage included.

CONTENTS OF No. XII.

Journal of the Farmers' Assembly,	-	357
Discussion on Wheat and its Culture by a Section of the State Agricultural Society during the late Fair,	-	375
Comparative value of Guano and Extra Home-Made Manures,	-	378
Fourth Annual Exhibition of the Va. State Agricultural Society,	-	383
Mr. Bruce's Donation,	-	384
Fairs of the Union, Seaboard and Rappahannock Agricultural Societies,	-	385
To Subscribers.—General Notice, &c.	-	385
Index to Vol. XVI.,	-	386, 388

INDEX

TO

VOLUME XVI.

A.	
Agricultural Profits,	12
Agricultural Education,	43
Ailment in Cows,	92
Army Worm,	316
Agricultural and Commercial Review, 221, 253	
Agencies,	224
Animals, improved breeds of,	249
Annual Address of the State Agricultural Society's Fair,	253
American Star Pulverizer and Harrow,	273
Acid, free, in Soils,	269, 345
American Farmer,	345
Asparagus, cultivation of,	348
August Storms,	355
Agricultural Implements. Report of United Farmers' Club on,	198
Assembly, Farmers'. Journal of,	357
Agricultural Societies. Fairs of the Union, Seaboard and Roanoke,	385
B.	
Beef Packing in Chicago,	5
Bells on Sheep,	12
Beef, how to cook a Sirloin of,	92
Blue Clay. Essay on,	118
Breeding, principles of,	57
Bledsoe, Prof. Review of his Work, Liberty and Slavery,	148
Bledsoe, Prof. Review of his Reviewer,	193
Boil your Molasses,	200
Broadcast Corn,	239
Brown Bread for Dyspepsia,	259, 301
Blacking for Harness,	302
Barry, Mr. Address on Fruit Culture,	332
Blankets for Negroes,	339
Buckwheat, cultivation of,	244, 350
Buildings, Hints on,	299
Breadstuffs,	348
Bruce, Mr. Jas. C. His Donation to the Union Agricultural Society,	384
C.	
Clay, Blue. Essay on,	118
Clover Seed, crop of 1855,	42
Cheap Drains,	53
Cucumbers, early,	58
Corn, Indian. Essay on cultivation of, by R. W. N. Nowland,	65
Corn, Seed and Planting,	70
Cows, Ailment in,	92
Corn Planters,	122
Corn, Experiments on, with Chappel's Fertilizer and Deburg's Super-Phosphate of Lime,	129
Corn, Experiments with mixed Peruvian and Mexican Guano,	130
Campbell, Dr. A. A., Report on his Farm,	132
Chickens, Gapes in,	172, 274
Cattle, a Herd of Heavy	188
Cheese, Pot,	200
Chronic Rheumatism in Horses,	202
Chinch Bug,	223
Christopher Quandary, letter to,	229
Clover Seed, gathering and cleaning,	235
Corn, Broadcast,	239
Clod Crusher, Crockill's,	250
Corn, machine for husking,	264
Cooke, Gen. John H., crop of wheat,	268
Clover and Peas, use of Phosphates on	268
Chickens, Disease in,	269
Chess, to clean out of Wheat,	271
Cycles of hot and cold weather,	202
Corn crop, selecting Seed,	286
Cider Mills, Portable,	285
Chloride of Lime, as a remedy for Smut,	288
Chemistry as applied to Agriculture,	298
Crop, a profitable,	19
Clubs, Farmers'	18
Corn, best mode of applying guano to, 124, 225	
Corn, Major J. H. Steger's letter on the cultivation of,	140
D.	
Ditch Digger, Pratt's,	15
Drains, cheap,	53
Ditching,	122
Devon Cattle, sale of,	178
Dogs, a tax on Female,	248
Distemper, Memoir on the Summer Distemper among cows and oxen, by Dr. John P. Mettauer,	307
De Burg's super-phosphate of Lime, experiments with,	129
Ditches, cleaning out by means of scraper,	197
Donation, Mr. Bruce's,	384
E.	
Experiment on cutting tops and pulling fodder,	33
Education, Agricultural,	43
Eppes, Thomas W.'s, Chester hogs,	73
Experiments with Manures,	122
Experiments, comparative with guano,	123
Experiments with guano on Tobacco,	129
Experiments with Chappel's Fertilizer and De Burg's Superphosphate of Lime,	129
Experiments with mixed Peruvian and Mexican guano on wheat and corn,	130
Experiments in Topdressing wheat with guano,	140
Exhibition, Fourth Annual, of the Virginia State Agricultural Society,	261
Egg-Hatching machine, Self-acting,	275
Experiment on the Elementary Principles of Manure as applied to the growth of wheat,	283

England, Old and New, comparative farming in,	299	Horses, chronic rheumatism in,	202
England, New, abandonment of farms in,	346	Horses, Sweeney in	204
F.		Horses, Oxen <i>vs.</i>	234
Farmers' Clubs,	18	Horse raising, letter from the late Wm. R. Johnson,	242
Fodder, experiment in pulling, and cutting tops,	33	Horses, a wrinkle about the age of,	279
Furrow Cleaner, one wanted,	51	Harness, Blacking for	302
Farmers, will they read and write,	53	Hop culture in Massachusetts,	302
Farming and stock breeding, by associat'n,	113	Horses, interesting facts about	306
Family group, a, in the Valley of Virginia,	114	Horses, Feeding,	326
Farming, Physical and Intellectual Pleasures of,	71	I.	
Food, relative progress of vegetable food in the United States,	116	Inspection Laws, Essay on,	80
Farm Buildings. Prize essay on, by S. F. Christian of Augusta,	137	Irish Potatoes,	90
Food for farm stock, preparing,	174	Irrigation. Prize essay on, by W. Gordon,	161
Fowls, disease among,	234	India Rubber, hard goods of,	350
Felly cutting machine,	273	J.	
Fruits, hints on preserving,	274	Joint Worm. Report of R. W. N. Nowland on the premium offered for best mode of extirpating	10
Fever, Bilious in cows, remedy for,	278	Jefferson Farmer, a reply to	41
Fall Ploughing,	343	Jerusalem Artichoke,	297
Farms, abandonment of, in New England,	346	K.	
Fly in wheat, to destroy,	347	Kelp as a manure,	181
Farmers' Assembly. Journal of,	357	Khaisi Cattle and their crosses,	339
G.		L.	
Gardens, management of,	67	Land, ridging up for Winter,	4
Guano as a fertilizer, &c. Premium essay by Dr. P. B. Pendleton, of Louisa,	73	Land, importance of shelter for,	43
Game in New York,	93	Labour Saving,	54
Guano, rolling seed in,	123	Liberty and Slavery. Review of Professor Bledsoe's,	149, 193
Guano, comparative experiments with,	124	Land, Mr. Crenshaw's. His success with Merino sheep,	183
Guano, best mode of applying to corn,	124	Lands, wet	234
Guano, experiment with, on Tobacco,	129	Lime, application of	74, 239
Guano, experiment, see p.	130	Live Stock. Great sale of	242
Guano, the great discovery,	143, 253	Lands in Nicholas County,	256
Guano, the new,	145	Land, improvement of, from its own resources,	325
Gate, Circular self-acting,	173	M.	
Guano Convention, the	178, 244	Mules <i>vs.</i> Horses,	13
Guano attachment to the wheat drill,	182	Money,	39
"Gardening for the South," a new work,	182	Manures, see article guano,	130
Guano, random thoughts on the use of,	255	Moncure, C. P. Valedictory Address to the United Farmers' Club,	153
Gravel walks,	348	Mangel Wurzel,	245
Garden, Rotation of crops in,	352	Manure of Flesh,	257
Gardening in Virginia,	355	Manure, elementary principles as applied to the growth of wheat,	283
Geology,	264	Manure. On certain high-priced fertilizers,	280
Guano and home-made Manures. Comparative value of,	378	Manure, Lawes and Leiby's controversy concerning	97
H.		Manures, comparative value of extra home-made and Guano,	378
Horses, small better than large,	10	N.	
Horses, Mules <i>versus</i>	13	Nottoway Agricultural Club,	92
Horses, Training,	13	Negro Cabins,	121
Hog fattening,	54	Negro absorption, comparative morality, North and South,	203
Hogs, to free from Lice,	56	O.	
Horses, Lexington and Lecompte,	72	Oxen, pulling against the yoke,	19
Horses, tonic for,	92	Overseers,	48, 147
Hawks, how to destroy	93, 136	Oil, cheap for kitchen lamps,	189
Horn ail,	158	Onions, cooking	198
Harvest drink, diet and medicine,	183	Oxen <i>vs.</i> Horses,	234
Hay covers,	184	Orchard, what may be done with a poor	238
Half bred South Downs,	185		
Horses, what they cost Pennsylvania Farmers,	185		
Hollow horn,	187		

P.		Seaboard Agricultural Society,	315
Profits, Agricultural	12	Slaughter-House at Montmatre,	327
Potatoes, Irish	90	Seeds. Life of,	355
Potato Pudding, Sweet	92	State Agricultural Society. Fourth Annual Exhibition of,	383
Potato, Japan	181	T.	
Pea Weevils,	190	Turpentine,	1
Premiums of the Virginia State Agricultural Society,	205, 223	Tobacco. Experiments with guano on,	129
Proposition, a noble	259	Tidegate,	186
Plantation Hygiene,	317	Turnip culture,	201
Portraits from the field and farm yard,	334	Tobacco. Its culture and manage, by Dr. R. F. Taylor of Amelia,	295
Ploughing, Fall	343	Tobacco culture in Massachusetts,	302
Potatoes, Sweet, to keep	348	Trees,	337
Phosphates, use of, on Clover and Peas,	268	V.	
Plough, best	282	Valley of Virginia. Soils of. Prize Essay on	20
Plastering, good and bad,	285	Valley of Virginia. Soils of. Review of Prof. Gilham's Essay on,	156
Pea fallow,	316	Virginia State Agricultural Society. No. of members in,	188
Pea fallow, how to sow wheat on,	315	Virginia State Agricultural Society. Fourth Annual Exhibition of,	216
Q.		Vegetation. Philosophy of,	320
Quandary, Christopher. A very good letter to	229	W.	
R.		Wheat. A new enemy of,	9, 79
Report on Rockland—farm of R. B. Haxall, of Orange county,	34	Wheat. Increase the crop,	128
Reports. Sundry from Nottoway Farmers' Club,	129-136	Wheat. Experiment with mixed Mexican and Peruvian guano on,	130
Root Crops. Cultivation of,	246	Wheat, Essay on. By Dr. Campbell, of Nottoway,	133
Report to the Locust bottom Agricultural Club,	258	Wheat Crop in Va. for 1856. Prospect of,	183
Reaping Machine—as an implement of practical utility,	354	Wool-packing,	155
Reaper, Morrison's. Trial of Reaping Machines in England,	329	Wool. Cleaning and carding,	190
Reaping Machines, with a notice of Caldwell's,	222	Wheat. Comparative receipts of, in Richmond, for 1855-'56,	254
Review. Agricultural and Commercial,	221-253-338	Wheat. Smut in,	234
S.		Wheat. Mediterranean. Letter concerning,	265
Shelter cheaper than fodder,	7	Wheat. Cultivation of,	266
Stall feeding Sheep,	8	Wheat. Harvesting,	268
Sheep. Bells on,	12	Wheat. Gen. J. H. Cocke's crop of	268
Soils of the Valley of Va. Prize Essay on, by Prof. Wm. S. Gilham, of V. M. I.	20	Wheat. To clean chess or cheat out of	271
Swine. Suffolk and other breeds,	36	Wheat. Smut in. Chloride of lime as a remedy for,	288
Sheep. What Census says about,	38	Wheat. Lime as a preventive of Smut in,	279
Sheep in the Valley of Va. Prize Essay on, by S. F. Christian,	45	Wheat Fly. Sowing lime to kill,	92
Soil. Exhaustion of,	47	Wheat-growing. Report of Committee of Locust Bottom Farmers' Club on,	293
Soil. Power of different, to retain water,	59	Wine. To make pure of apples,	300
Saliva. Use of,	79	Wheat. Winter cultivation of,	304
Sheep. Best mode of protecting from dogs,	122	Wheat. How to sow on Pea fallow,	315
Seed. Rolling in Guano,	123	Wheat. Comparative produce of different kinds,	330
Sheep. Watering and other care,	157	Wheat-threshing by Steam power,	329
Sheep. Washing and pack wool,	157	Wheat-growers in North Carolina. Important to,	339
Strawberries. Princess Alice Maud,	182	Wheat Plant. Growth of,	330
Steam-power for Farm purposes,	200	Wheat Fly. To destroy,	347
Scraper. Use of in cleaning out ditches, mill races, &c.,	197	Wheat. Production and consumption of	352
Soap. Manufacture of,	275	Wagon Cover. How to make,	338
Strawberries. Selection of twelve of the most esteemed varieties,	296	Wheat and its culture. Discussion of, by the Virginia State Agricultural Society during the late Fair,	375
Seeds. Quantity of different by weight and measure,	303	Y.	
		Yarn. A fact worth knowing,	19



NON-CIRCULATING



